BV
811
.C9
1869

CATECHISM OF BAPTISM,

By P. P. Quirk

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. BV811
Shelf .C9
Copyright 1869

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A

CATECHISM OF BAPTISM.

#7029

BY

REV. DUNCAN D. CURRIE,

OF THE CONFERENCE OF EASTERN BRITISH AMERICA.

"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean."—EZEKIEL 36 : 25.

"And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh."—JOEL 2 : 28.

"For the promise is unto you, and to your children."—ACTS 2 : 39.

ENLARGED EDITION.

New-York:

S. W. GREEN, PRINTER, 16 AND 18 JACOB STREET.

1869.

BV811
.C9
1869

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1869, by
DUNCAN D. CURRIE,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New-York.

PREFACE.

This Catechism is written because such a work is believed to be needed. Many, who have not access to larger and better books on this theme, will be glad to accept a compact, concise, and clear statement of this subject, as it is taught in the volume of inspiration. Of course, in a work of so small compass, the writer could only present an outline of some of the points that invite discussion. Those into whose hands this pamphlet will fall, and who have thought and read largely upon this topic, will recognize, in the arguments advanced, many old acquaintances, and in very much the same garb in which they have been met before. The writer has aimed, in the preparation of these pages, to be useful rather than original. He has borrowed freely, when it suited his purpose to do so. He is, moreover, specially indebted to the admirable works on baptism, by Rev. F. G. Hibbard, D.D., and Rev. D. D. Wheden, D.D. It is believed this work will do good; and, invoking the blessing of God upon it, it is sent forth to accomplish its destiny.

D. D. C.

Sussex Vale, N. B., May, 1864.

PREFACE TO ENLARGED EDITION.

The first part of this Catechism was published about five years ago. Several editions of the work have, meanwhile, been sold. Various circumstances have combined to indicate the necessity of a fuller treatment of the subject than was aimed at in the preparation of the first edition. The criticisms to which it has been subjected, by persons of opposite views, have called for consideration. The second part of this work has, therefore, been written. If it had not been that the first part was originally stereotyped, it is probable that, in preparing the larger work, the mould would have been broken up, and the work recast. The writer acknowledges indebtedness to others who have preceded him in this field of discussion; and he is specially indebted, in the chapter on Classic Baptism, to an elaborate and excellent work on that subject, by Rev. James W. Dale. If these pages shall, as it is hoped, help inquiring minds to recognize and accept the truth, and thus promote the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, they will not have been written in vain. D. D. C.

Fredericton, N. B., October, 1869.

CONTENTS.

FIRST PART.

Chap.		Page
I.	Different Baptisms	5
II.	Jewish Baptisms	5
III.	Scriptural Washing	7
IV.	Importance of Mosaic Baptism	9
V.	Meaning of the Greek Word Baptizo	11
VI.	Classical Meaning of the Greek Word Baptizo	12
VII.	Scriptural Meaning of the Word Baptizo	13
VIII.	Affusion	16
IX.	The Baptism of the Holy Spirit	16
X.	John's Baptism	20
XI.	The Mode of John's Baptism	24
XII.	Christ's Baptism	24
XIII.	Christian Baptism	26
XIV.	The Subjects of Christian Baptism	28
XV.	Circumcision and Baptism	38
XVI.	Mode of Christian Baptism	39
XVII.	Philip and the Eunuch	41
XVIII.	The Jailer of Philippi	43
XIX.	Buried by Baptism	43
XX.	Israelites Baptized unto Moses	45
XXI.	Noah and the Ark	45
XXII.	Paul and Apollos	46
XXIII.	He that Believeth and is Baptized	47
XXIV.	The Immersionist Creed Inconsistent and Narrow	48

SECOND PART.

Chap.		Page
XXV.	Positions Defined	51
XXVI.	Immersionist Stratagem	53
XXVII.	Paul and Regeneration	60
XXVIII.	Immersionists and the Greek Word Baptizo	66
XXIX.	Meaning of Words	68
XXX.	Classic Baptism	70
XXXI.	Modes of Classic Baptism	72
XXXII.	Immersionist Inconsistencies	81
XXXIII.	Testimony of Christian Greek Authors	84
XXXIV.	The Baptism of Blood	86
XXXV.	Religious Purification	87
XXXVI.	Naaman the Syrian	92
XXXVII.	Greek Church Baptism	94
XXXVIII.	Christ's Ordination	97
XXXIX.	Dipping Difficulties	103
XL.	Immersionists and Infant Baptism	107
XLI.	The Covenant of Grace	110
XLII.	The Great Commission	115
XLIII.	The School of Christ	116
XLIV.	The Day of Pentecost	118
XLV.	Apostolic Examples	119
XLVI.	Believers' Baptism	122
XLVII.	Objections Considered	124
XLVIII.	The Immersionist Bible	123

A CATECHISM OF BAPTISM.

FIRST PART.

I.—Different Baptisms.

1. Are there different baptisms mentioned in the Scriptures?

Yes. Jewish baptisms, or the baptisms required by the Mosaic ritual. John's baptism. Christian baptism, or the baptism of water required in the Christian dispensation. And the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

II.—Jewish Baptisms.

2. What were the Jewish baptisms?

Various washings imposed by the Mosaic ritual, and which were to continue until the beginning of the Christian dispensation. Hebrews 9 : 8–10: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, (*baptisms* in the original Greek,) and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation."

3. To what did these baptisms pertain?

These divers baptisms were ordinances pertaining to the flesh or body; they were therefore personal.

4. How is it shown that these baptisms were personal?

The Apostle contrasts the inefficacy of these various baptisms, visibly applied to the person to purify the conscience, with the sufficient efficacy of the blood of Christ when sprinkled in behalf of the person. Hebrews 9 : 13, 14: "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the

blood of Christ . . . . purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God."

5. Were the priests to be subjects of these baptisms?

It was required of the priests that they should be cleansed for the work of the ministry and the priesthood, by the sprinkling of water upon them, and by their being anointed with oil.

6. Did the Mosaic ritual require that the priests should be washed with water?

Yes. And that ritual also shows that God's method of cleansing or washing the person is by the visible mode of sprinkling.

7. Is it affirmed in the Mosaic ritual that the priest should bathe himself in water?

It is; and it will be shown hereafter in these pages, that the word rendered "bathe" means to *wash* or to *sprinkle*.

8. By what passages of Scripture is it proved that the priests were to be washed or cleansed by the sprinkling of water upon them?

Exodus 29: 1–7: "And this is the thing that thou shalt do unto them, to hallow them to minister unto me in the priest's office, ... Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water; . . . . then shalt thou take the anointing oil and pour it upon his head, and anoint him." Exodus 40: 12–15: "Thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons, and wash them with water. . . . . And thou shalt anoint them, ... that they may minister unto me in the priest's office, for their anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations." Numbers 8: 5–7: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying: Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And *thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them.*"

9 What was the mode prescribed in the Mosaic law for the cleansing of the lepers?

They were to be sprinkled seven times. Leviticus

14 : 7 : "And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean."

10. What ceremony did the ritual of Moses require for the cleansing from a dead man?

Whoever touched a dead body was unclean under the law, and could only be washed or made clean by having water sprinkled upon him. Numbers 19 : 13–20 : "Whosoever toucheth (a dead body) . . . . because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean. And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and *sprinkle it* upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and *upon the persons* that were there, and upon him that touched one dead," etc. . . . . "But the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation; . . . . the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him; he is unclean."

11. Did these washings, which the Apostle Paul called "divers baptisms," include the baptism of all the people?

Yes; as all were sinners and needed cleansing, so all were required to be sprinkled, that they might thereby be washed or made clean. Hebrews 9 : 19 : "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people *according to the law*, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and *sprinkled* both the book, *and all the people*."

12. Were any persons baptized under the law by immersion?

There were sometimes the immersions of cups and other inanimate things, but never the immersion of a person. There is no passage of Scripture to show that any person was ever washed or cleansed by immersion, though the priests and all the people were baptized — that is, washed, or cleansed, by sprinkling.

III.—Scriptural Washing.

13. Of what is baptism symbolical?

Baptism is the outward symbol of the inward washing or cleansing from impurity.

14. Is Scriptural washing in close analogy, as regards the mode, with the ordinary washings in every-day life?

No. The Scriptural washing of a person is always effected in connection with the act of sprinkling. But the ordinary washing of a person, and washing generally, in daily life, are performed by rubbing, or similar operations. It is neither by simple immersion, nor sprinkling, that we wash ourselves, our clothing, or our furniture. The immersion of a person, or thing, under water is not of itself sufficient to cleanse. God's wisely established plan, however, is that in *spiritual life* sprinkling is washing, through sprinkling there is cleansing.

15. Do the dictionaries of our language show that to wash means to immerse?

Worcester (edition 1849) gives nine different meanings of the verb to wash, but no one of these is to immerse. Webster (unabridged edition, 1861) gives twelve different definitions, but in no one of these does he indicate that the word means simply to immerse. The second definition given by him is: "To wet; to fall on and moisten, as *the rain washes the flowers or plants.*"

16. Do the Scriptures teach that immersion is essential to washing?

No. The application of water to a part of the body significantly represented the perfect cleansing or purity of the whole man. It was a custom not only among the Hebrews, but also among the Greeks and Latins, to wash their hands in token of their innocence, and to show that they were pure from any imputed guilt. In Isaiah 6 : 7, it is shown that the entire purgation of the prophet from moral defilement was secured by simply applying a coal of fire to his lips only. "Lo," says the seraph, "this hath touched thy lips, and thy iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged." Psalm 26 : 6 : "I will wash my hands in innocency." Matthew 27 : 44 : "Pilate . . . . took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just man."

17. By what passages of Scripture is it proved that

the heart and flesh are made clean or purified through the act of sprinkling?

Ezekiel 36 : 25 : "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." Psalm 51 : 7 : "Purge me with hyssop, (as the law required, Leviticus, chapter 14, that is, take hyssop, and dip it in water, and sprinkle me,) and I shall be clean: wash me, (in this way,) and I shall be (spiritually) whiter than snow." Hebrews 9 : 13 : "The blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer *sprinkling* the unclean, *sanctifieth* to the purifying of the flesh." Hebrews 10 : 22 : "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed (that is, sprinkled) with pure water."

18. What authority have you for supposing that the word washed, in Hebrews 10 : 22, should be sprinkled, and not immersed?

There is no passage in the Scriptures that teaches that to wash means to immerse. The Holy Spirit has not chosen to make immersion a symbol for the washing or cleansing of a person; but, on the contrary, sprinkling is throughout the Bible the symbol of the cleansing and the blessing of the bodies and the souls of men. We need, therefore, the double baptism — having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies sprinkled—that is, baptized—with pure water.

19. What is meant by the bathing required in the purification of the Jews?

The Hebrew word, which in some passages is rendered "bathe," means only to "wash," and is in many places in our English Bible now rendered *wash*. Bathing does not imply immersion, and may be performed without it, and is so performed by multitudes every day.

IV.—Importance of Mosaic Baptism.

20. In what consists the importance of Mosaic baptism?

The water baptism of the Mosaic ritual ought not

to be undervalued by us, because of *its identity with Christian baptism.*

21. Wherein can this identity be recognized?

Firstly, the import of baptism under both dispensations is *consecration.* Secondly, the one grand idea pervading the whole system of revelation in the Old Testament and in the New, is the cleansing and renewing of man's depraved nature by the dispensation of God's Spirit, and this is symbolized in the system of water-lustrations, or cleansings, in both Testaments.

22. Why is it that in the new dispensation there is but one baptism, whereas in the old there were "divers baptisms"?

The peculiar nature of the Levitical dispensation made its various baptisms indispensable; the superior simplicity of the *new* admitted of their being condensed into one, and that one to occupy the initiatory place of abolished circumcision.

23. Were any others except the Jews baptized under the Mosaic ritual?

The Mosaic ritual was designed especially for the Jews alone, but during the interval of four hundred years between the Old Testament and the New, the Jewish rabbins are supposed to have invented the baptism of converts to the faith.

24. When a convert was received into the Jewish Church, to whom were the sign and seal of baptism applied?

If the convert were the head of a family, he and all his family, even to the children of eight days old, were proper subjects for baptism.

25. What word was generally used to express this initiatory rite?

The Greek word *baptizo* became the popular term; and, because of its frequent use in this connection, it came to be applied vernacularly to express any sacred ablution.

V.—Meaning of the Greek Word Baptizo.

26. What is the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo?*

It has a variety of meanings, like almost every other word in the Greek and other languages.

27. Do words have certain fixed significations?

No. Words are changeable in their significations. Words in frequent use in Shakespeare's writings are now unintelligible without a dictionary. Many of the household phrases of a hundred years ago are now obsolete. Words fade. They assume new shades of meaning. They die out. The same word is now used by different persons with various and sometimes opposite significations. No word has a fixed, arbitrary meaning. We use words as signs to express ideas, and our wants are so great that we must sometimes use old words in a new sense. In many instances, the best-chosen word but poorly expresses the idea of the thinker. Thoughts will sometimes weave a new garment for themselves, and there is then a new creation in the world of words. Hence new editions of our dictionaries are needed several times in a lifetime.

28. Is there any word in the Greek language that means what baptism means in the English?

No; it was not possible there could be such a word. By baptism we mean a *Christian ordinance*, in the observance of which persons are initiated into the Christian Church. The word *baptizo* originally had no sort of ecclesiastical sense. There was among the Greeks no such ordinance or ceremony, and therefore they had no need of a word to mean that which did not exist. They were no more likely to have a word in that language that meant baptism, than a word that meant photograph, or telegraph, or railroad, or steam-engine, or any thing unknown among them. A language might possess, in the grandest luxuriance, all the words that a heathen nation wants, and yet its vocabulary be barren of those terms which a Christian literature needs.

29. Why was the Greek word *baptizo* chosen to express the idea of baptism?

That word came the nearest to what we mean by baptism of any in the Greek. It was necessary, therefore, to choose that word, or, perhaps, coin one. The former alternative was preferred.

30. How many different significations has the word *baptizo?*

In the writings of Greek authors, the verb baptize, or the noun baptism, has been used with at least forty-seven different shades of meaning. It is unimportant to inquire what was the radical or primary meaning of the word. The point for us to consider is, in what sense did it come to be popularly used and to be popularly understood?

VI.—Classical Meaning of the Greek Word Baptizo.

31. How do you ascertain the classical meaning of the word *baptizo?*

By the best lexicons of the Greek language.

32. What are some of its significations as given in the best Greek lexicons?

Schrevelius, a great master of the Greek language, gives these definitions of baptizo: "To immerse, to wash, to sprinkle, to moisten, to wet."

Scapula and Hedericus give the same definitions.

Schleusner, in his Lexicon of the New Testament, a work of the highest authority, defines baptizo as follows: "1. To immerse in water; 2. To wash, or sprinkle, or cleanse with water; 3. To baptize; 4. To pour out largely."

Cole gives these definitions: "To baptize, to wash, to sprinkle."

Passow defines it: "To immerse, to wash, to sprinkle."

Suidas defines it: "To immerse, to moisten, to sprinkle, to wash, to cleanse."

Dwight's definitions are: "To tinge, stain, dye, or color."

GROVE defines it: "To dip, plunge, immerse, wash, wet, moisten, stain, sprinkle, steep, imbue, dye, color."

The learned GASES, a member of the Greek Church, whose Lexicon of Ancient Greek is generally used by the modern Greeks, gives these definitions of *baptizo:* "To wet or moisten, to wash, to draw water."

The lexicons agree in giving *wash* as the most prominent meaning of baptizo. If one affirms that he *washed* himself, we do not suppose him to mean that he *immersed* himself.

33. Is there any other way of ascertaining the classical meaning of baptizo?

Yes, by consulting the Greek authors, and noticing the connection in which the word stands, and the sense in which it was there obviously used.

34. With what significations did the Greek writers use the word baptizo?

Sometimes meaning one thing, and at other times something else, just as we use words. It was used both in the sense of dipping or immersion, and sprinkling or pouring; but it was never used by them in the sense of dipping or immersion *as a Christian rite.*

35. Did the Greek writers use the word baptizo when it could not possibly mean to immerse?

Yes, they sometimes used it in the sense of sprinkling, and when they meant nothing else. In the Greek writers we read of "baptizing the grass with dew;"—"baptizing a garment with needlework;"—"baptizing a wall with arrows;"—"baptizing the head with perfume;"—"baptizing the sea with the blood of a mouse." Plutarch, writing on the education of children, compares, by the Greek word for baptize, his labors to those of a gardener *sprinkling* or *pouring water* on his plants. In these places, to *baptize* could not possibly have meant to *immerse.*

VII.—SCRIPTURAL MEANING OF THE WORD BAPTIZO.

36. How do you find the *Scripture* meaning of *baptizo?*

By examining the connection in which the word stands, its obvious meaning may be ascertained.

37. What version do you employ for this purpose?

The Greek translation of the Old Testament. This is important, because it will determine the sense in which the Hellenistic Jews understood the word *baptizo*, and how it was applied by them in their ceremonial institutions. The Septuagint version was made by the Jews themselves, about two hundred and seventy-seven years before the Christian era, and was in use among those of that nation who spoke the Greek language at the time of our Lord's coming. To this translation the New Testament writers repeatedly refer, and from it they frequently quote, employing its very language in the same sense in their own inspired compositions. Here we may look for the ecclesiastical meaning of the word baptizo.

38. Is there any passage of Scripture where it is evident that baptism must necessarily mean immersion?

There is no passage in the Bible where the obvious meaning of baptism is immersion, and may not be sprinkling or pouring.

39. Is there any Scripture to show that to baptize necessarily means to sprinkle or pour upon, and can not possibly mean to immerse?

Yes, there are many passages that clearly show that baptism was frequently performed when there could not possibly have been immersion.

40. How do you prove that?

By the following considerations:

1. In Leviticus 14 : 4–6, the priest is required to take for the cleansing of the leper two birds, and to kill one of them, and preserve the blood in a vessel. He is then to *baptize* (it is "dip" in the English translation, but it is baptize in the Greek) the living bird, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, with the blood of the dead bird. It is manifestly impossible that this baptism could have been by immersion.

2. In 2 Kings 5: 14, Elisha told Naaman to go wash seven times in (or at) Jordan, and he went and baptized (it is "dipped" in the English version, but bap-

tized in the Greek) himself seven times. It is evident that he must have sprinkled himself seven times. Naaman was a leper. The leprosy was incurable by human means. God had provided a way by which a cure might surely be effected. There was no other way but God's way. That way is defined in Leviticus 14: 7: "And he shall *sprinkle upon him* that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean." Through this sprinkling there was to be cleansing. Naaman, who did not belong to Israel, heard of the cures effected through God's appointment, and went to the prophet. What did the prophet tell him? As a faithful prophet he must not make a law of his own, but must tell him to keep God's law. "Go and wash — that is, sprinkle — seven times." That was what the ritual of Moses required. In God's law sprinkling is washing. Elisha must have told him to sprinkle seven times, for the law required it. There was no reason why he should tell him any thing different from that. Naaman went and baptized himself seven times — that is, he sprinkled himself seven times. He did not immerse himself. No law required him to be immersed. To immerse would not be following the instructions given. To immerse would not cleanse him of the leprosy. Immersion is not symbolical of cleansing. He must have sprinkled himself seven times, for *he was made clean*—his flesh became as the flesh of a little child. He would never have been cleansed by going contrary to the law, but in its observance he secured the blessing. By comparing Scripture with Scripture, and allowing the Holy Spirit to be his own interpreter, it is evident that the baptism of Naaman could not have been by immersion, and must have been by sprinkling.

3. In Daniel 4: 33, Nebuchadnezzar, it is said, "was driven from men—and was *baptized* (it is translated "wet" in the English version, but it is baptized in the Greek) with the dew of heaven." It is manifestly impossible that his baptism *with dew* could have been by immersion.

4. In Mark 7 : 4, it is stated that the Pharisees observe "the baptisms (it is "washings" in the English translation, but baptisms in the Greek) of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and tables." That the mode of baptism here was sprinkling will be apparent if we refer to the Levitical rite to which they allude. In Numbers 19 : 18, the ritual requires that "a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it in the water, and *sprinkle it* upon the tent, and upon all the vessels." In these "baptisms" there could not have been immersion.

5. Throughout the New Testament the Greek word baptizo, is used in the sense of sprinkling, or pouring on. In Matthew 3 : 2, John foretold that Jesus would "baptize with the Holy Ghost," and Peter expressly recognizes the fulfillment of the promise in Acts 11 : 15, when "the Holy Ghost *fell* on them." This baptism could not have been by immersion.

VIII.—Affusion.

41. What is affusion?

The act of sprinkling, or pouring upon.

42. What is the difference between sprinkling and pouring?

They are substantially one. In both acts there is the application of the element to the person. To sprinkle is to scatter or disperse in small particles or drops. In pouring, the act is the same in form, but the element is shed forth more copiously.

43. What is immersion?

The act of putting into a fluid below the surface; dipping; plunging; overwhelming.

44. What is the difference between affusion and immersion?

In affusion the element descends upon the subject; in immersion the subject is plunged into the element.

IX.—The Baptism of the Holy Spirit.

45. In what relation does the baptism of the Holy Spirit stand to water baptism?

The baptism of the Holy Spirit is the *real* and *essential* baptism; that of water is the *symbolical*, or *figurative*.

46. Wherein do they differ?

In the real baptism the administrator is God; the element is his Holy Spirit; and the subject is the individual. In the symbolical baptism the administrator is God's minister; the element is water; and the subject is the human person.

47. Which is the more important?

The real baptism is more important than its symbolical representation. The application of the Spirit is essential to salvation. Our Lord says, John 3 : 5 : "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." As if he had said: "Except a man be born (not only) of water, (which, as the mere emblem, is the less important, but also) of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

48. Are the terms used to denote the baptism of the Spirit figurative?

No. When God baptizes with his Spirit the thing is *real*, and the term is *literal*. We are not to suppose that because the term employed was *spiritual*, it was therefore *figurative*.

49. In what mode is the baptism of the Spirit always represented as being performed?

The baptism of the Spirit, in his renovating and sanctifying operation, is always expressed under the conception of its descent upon the subject. When there is the operation of the Spirit for other purposes, that is never called baptism.

50. What Scripture proofs can you give to show both the sanctifying descent of the Spirit and its representation by the symbol of water affusion?

Isaiah 44 : 3 : "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." Beautiful emblem! "I will *pour water—I will pour my Spirit*."

Ezekiel 36 : 25–27: "Then will I sprinkle clean water

upon you, and ye shall be clean ; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you ; . . . . and I will put my Spirit within you." Here also the Spirit's influences are associated with the sprinkling of water.

Psalm 72 : 6 : "He (Messiah) shall come down like rain upon the mown grass." Hosea 10 : 12 : "Seek the Lord till he come and rain righteousness upon you." Hosea 14 : 5 : "I will be as the dew unto Israel." Here the refreshing influences of the *real* baptism are represented by a metaphor taken from *the falling of dew and of rain.*

51. Is the symbolism between the Spirit and the water taught, under the new dispensation, as under the old ?

Yes. Only it is more definitely developed in the new, under the name and form of the double baptism. Matthew 3 : 11 : "I indeed baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Luke 3 : 16 : "I indeed baptize you with water ; but one mightier than I cometh ; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." John 1 : 33 : "He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me : Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."

52. By what passages of Scripture does it appear that in the baptism of the Spirit there is no immersion, but that the element descends upon the subject ?

Proverbs 1 : 23 : "I will pour out my Spirit unto you."

Matthew 3 : 16 : "He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him." Here was baptism, but not immersion. He was not plunged into the Spirit.

Acts 2 : 3 : "There appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them." There was no immersion here. A sound filled the house, and the baptism of fire *sat upon* them.

Acts 2 : 16, 17, 38 : "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel : I will pour out of my

Spirit." This outpouring is called baptism. "Then Peter said: Repent, and be baptized every one of you: and ye shall *receive the gift* of the Holy Ghost." This could not have been immersion. One could not be said to receive an element in which he was immersed. Moreover, it is said, "the gift of the Holy Ghost was *poured out.*"

Acts 10: 44–47: "The Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. . . . On the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. . . . Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost?" As they had *received* the real baptism, so should they *receive* the symbolical baptism.

Acts 11 : 15, 16 : "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell on* them, *as on us* at the beginning. Then remembered I the word (not of John, but) of the Lord, how that he said: John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Thus Peter pronounces the outpouring and the falling of the Holy Spirit to be baptism.

53. What important point is confirmed by the argument drawn from the baptism of the Spirit?

The biblical, ritual use of the word baptize is established. Whatever may have been its primary meaning, we learn its meaning when used in a Christian sense. "The Bible is its own dictionary. The Spirit is his own interpreter." The thing has been made so visible that we may see it. God himself has given a definition of the word in question. "He *poured out* upon his Son, visibly and really—it was pouring, and not immersion, and *he called it baptism.* The Holy Ghost *descended upon* the disciples, and *sat upon* them, and this *he calls baptism.* "On the Gentiles also was *poured out* the gift of the Holy Ghost," and this affusion he calls *baptism.*

54. If the real and essential baptism is performed by affusion, ought not the symbolical and figurative baptism to be performed by the same mode?

The mode of the former should in all fairness determine

the mode of the latter. The symbolical act should be a true representation of the real thing. If the form of a symbol does not express the reality it is not really a symbol. The design of a symbol is to present to the mind the idea of an unseen reality. We should make all things according to the pattern showed to us in the mount. Behold that pattern showed to thee when God himself baptized! See that pattern where at Pentecost he baptized his disciples! It was by affusion, and not by immersion, that blessed work was done. And if thus it is that God baptizeth us, is not this the way in which his ministers should baptize his people?

X.—John's Baptism.

55. What was John's baptism?

An ordinance performed by John, independent of the regular services of the synagogue of the Jews, and intended to prepare them, in connection with repentance, for the aftercoming of Christ.

56. Why was John's baptism called the baptism of repentance?

He was specially commissioned to preach repentance, and baptize all who came to him with repentance, confessing their sins.

57. Was John's baptism performed under the Christian dispensation?

No. The Christian dispensation was not inaugurated when John preached and baptized. This dispensation did not commence until after Christ had died, and risen again. John's work was finished and his life ended before the Jewish system was discarded. John never, in his preaching, spoke of the new dispensation as established already, but as being "at hand."

58. Was John's baptism Christian baptism?

No. John had died several years before Christian baptism was instituted. Christian baptism is a ceremonial ordinance in which men are initiated into the Church of Christ. John never received any person into the

Christian Church. The persons baptized by John still remained members of the Jewish church, and were as much the subjects of Christian baptism afterward, as if they had never been baptized. Christian baptism must be administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. John baptized upon the confession of sin, before conversion, and without faith. Many of those baptized by John had never heard of a Holy Ghost, nor had they been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; they were therefore again baptized with Christian baptism. See Acts 19 : 1–6. That John's baptism was not Christian baptism has been admitted by a distinguished Baptist divine, (Rev. Robert Hall.) He says: "A Christian ordinance, not founded on the authority of Christ, not the *effect* but the *means* of his manifestation, and first executed by one who knew him not, is an *incomprehensible mystery*."

59. In what locality did John preach and baptize?

It is said that he baptized "in Jordan," and again, "in the river of Jordan." The preposition here rendered "in" has, like other words, a variety of meanings, and it means "at," or "near to," or "by," as much as it means "in." Those passages that indicate the scene of John's labors do not affirm any thing more than that John preached and baptized in that part of the country lying "near to" the Jordan.

60. Is similar phraseology employed in the present day without implying the idea of immersion?

It is not unusual to hear persons speak of having been *in* a certain river, when they do not design to affirm that they were in the waters thereof. There is a locality in Nova Scotia called "River John." A Wesleyan minister is annually appointed to labor *in* River John. It is not only the river itself that bears that name but *the country lying in the vicinity of that river*. That minister preaches and baptizes in River John, but baptizing in River John does not mean immersion, for his mode of baptism is sprinkling. It is as incorrect to suppose that he immerses any one, because he baptizes in River John,

as it is to suppose that John the Forerunner of Christ immersed any one because he baptized in the river Jordan. The Jordan had several banks within banks, and the whole country lying within these outer banks was called "the river Jordan;" hence a person could be in the river Jordan, so called, and on dry ground at the same time. John could therefore baptize in Jordan and not enter the water of the stream.

61. How is it proved by the Scriptures that the phrase "in the river of Jordan" does not mean in the water of Jordan?

By passages which are *more definite* than those which simply say in the river Jordan. For John might have been baptizing several miles away from the waters of Jordan, and still it might have been said he was baptizing in, that is, near to, the river of Jordan. Moreover, it is never said he baptized *in water*, but always *with* water.

In Mark 1 : 4, it is said, "John did baptize *in the wilderness*," and yet the following verse says it was "in the river of Jordan." This apparent contradiction is easily explained by showing that he baptized in a wilderness which was *near to* the river of Jordan. It is plainly affirmed that he baptized "in the wilderness." That could not therefore have meant immersion in the water of Jordan.

In John 1 : 26–28, it is said : "John answered them, saying, I baptize *with water:* but there standeth one among you whom ye know not; . . . . these things were done in Bethabara, *beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.*" Bethabara, where John gave his testimony concerning Christ, and where he was baptizing, was not in Jordan, but *beyond it.* This Bethabara was at one time called Bethany. There was a Bethany about two miles from Jerusalem; and there was another Bethany, here called Bethabara, in the tribe of Reuben, east of Jordan, and yet near to it. This was where John baptized—not in the water of the Jordan, but beyond it.

John 10 : 40 : And Jesus "went away again *beyond Jor-*

dan, into the place *where John at first baptized*, and there he abode." When it is affirmed elsewhere that John at first baptized *in* Jordan it is evident that it was not by immersion in the water of Jordan, but *near to* that river, as the Greek preposition indicates, and yet "beyond Jordan," as is plainly declared.

That to be "in Jordan" does not necessarily mean to be "in the water," is evident from Joshua 3 : 8 : "When ye shall come to the brink of the water of Jordan ye shall stand still in Jordan." Hence "in Jordan" and "in the water" are by no means synonymous terms.

The rendering of the passages in our version referring to John's baptism is contradictory and inexplicable, if we regard some of them as meaning immersion in the water of Jordan. Luke says, John preached and baptized in "all the country about Jordan." Another evangelist says, he baptized "beyond Jordan." Another locates him "in the wilderness." And yet they say it was in Jordan. There is only one way of reconciling this apparent contradiction, and that is by substituting for the preposition "in" the words "near to," which is the meaning of the Greek as much as "in" is. Then the narratives will all agree in simply locating the scene of John's labors in that part of the country lying in the vicinity of the Jordan. Every difficulty will then be removed ; the whole record will then be plain, probable, natural, consistent, and reasonable. If John was accustomed to immerse in the water of Jordan, as some affirm, how pointless and meaningless the passage which says he went to Ænon because there was much water there! That would be leaving plenty of water, and going to less. But if we regard John as an itinerant, going about doing good, we wonder not that he should be glad to locate for a time, with his followers, at a place of "many springs," as Ænon was, and sometimes along the shores of Jordan's stream, not merely because he needed water to baptize with, but because, for other purposes, such multitudes as accompanied him would require an abundant supply of water.

XI.—The Mode of John's Baptism.

62. Did John baptize by immersion?

There is no passage in the Bible which proves that John immersed.

63. Why do immersionists suppose that John immersed?

Great stress is laid upon certain prepositions, "in," and "into," and "out of," and they might just as correctly have been rendered respectively, "near to," and "to," and "from," and the translation would thereby have been more definite and correct. It is also affirmed that going *down into* and coming *up out of* the water imply immersion. The logic which teaches that immersion inevitably follows from going into and coming out of the water, appears rather defective to most persons. In their judgment it is difficult to establish the point, that having been in the water implies having been under it; but nevertheless to some there appears no flaw in the argument, and upon this assumption a theory is built.

64. Does our English translation of the Scriptures, as it now reads, imply immersion?

No. One may baptize in a river, and not immerse. One may go down into the water, and not be immersed. One may come up out of the water without having been under it. One may drive his horse down into the water, and up out of the water, and not have him immersed. Going down into the water, and coming up out of it, do not imply going under it. The word of God does not say that John immersed. "He baptized *with* water," is the repeated testimony of God's word; and *baptism with water means affusion* and not immersion. John tells us himself, that he was to be followed by Him who was to "*sprinkle all nations*," and that his own baptism was but the type of His great *outpouring* of the Spirit and the fire.

XII.—Christ's Baptism.

65. With what baptism was our Lord baptized?

It was not John's baptism, for he had no need of

repentance, which that baptism implied. It was not Christian baptism, for that was not instituted until several years after he had been baptized. The nature of the case makes it impossible that he could be baptized in his own name; therefore he could not receive Christian baptism. Christian baptism is a symbol of cleansing from inward impurity; and he had no such impurity from which to be cleansed. He was baptized "to fulfill all righteousness;" that is, all the requirements of the law. He came among men that he might become a minister of his gospel, and our Great High Priest, and he had to fulfill all the requirements of the law appertaining to those offices.

66. What did the law require of our Lord as a minister and a priest?

The Mosaic ritual required that he would not begin to preach until he should be thirty years of age, and not then without being sprinkled with water. Numbers 8: 5–7: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Take the Levites from among the children of Israel and cleanse them. And *thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them.*"

67. How does it appear that these laws applied to Jesus?

They were parts of the established ritual, and were binding upon every one who entered upon the office of the ministry and the priesthood, from Aaron down to Christ.

68. Might not Christ be exempt from these laws, inasmuch as he was holy?

No. He made himself subject to his own laws. He was holy because he kept every law faithfully. He could not preach until he was thirty years old, because he must keep the law. He could not be our faithful High Priest unless he kept the law. "Think not," says he, "that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill."

69. Did the law require that Jesus should be immersed, or that he should be sprinkled?

There was *no law that required him to be immersed.* There is no evidence in the Scriptures to show that he was ever immersed. *The law required him to be sprinkled* before entering on his ministry. If he was not so sprinkled he violated the law, and could not be a priest. He must have been sprinkled by John, for it is said he was "baptized to fulfill all righteousness." The law is explicit: "Thus shalt thou do unto them, (the priests:) *Sprinkle* water of purifying upon them."

70. Is Christ our example in baptism?

No. The baptism of Christ was an official act. By it he was inducted into the priesthood at the age of thirty years. We should follow Christ in *moral* conduct, but not in his official acts. We are not to follow Christ in all things. He was a preacher; but all are not to follow Christ in that office. He never married; all are not to follow Christ in that particular. He was circumcised; we need not follow Christ in that ordinance. To follow Christ in baptism would be to follow him into a priestly office. If he were our example in baptism, none should be baptized until the age of thirty years, and his example would not therefore be worthy of all imitation. If he were an example in baptism, he failed to be an example to the age in which he lived, for Jesus was not baptized, until about the close of John's ministry, and until after "all the people were baptized." (Luke 3 : 21.) There is no proof in the Scriptures, direct or indirect, that our Saviour was baptized as an example for us. Christ never made a profession of faith: such a profession was with him unnecessary and impossible, since *he himself* is the only Being in whom faith can be exercised unto salvation. How, then, could he have been our example in baptism? How can we "follow our Saviour" in this respect?

XIII.—Christian Baptism.

71. What is Christian baptism?

Baptism as a Christian ordinance is the application of pure water to a proper subject, by a lawful administrator,

in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

72. Are these conditions essential?

The water should be *pure*, as it is intended to symbolize the inward purifying of the *real* baptism of the Spirit. If the water be not pure, it fails to be a real symbol. The commission was given to ministers of the Gospel alone to baptize, subject to certain conditions. No others have a right to perform this office. It must be done in the name of the Sacred Trinity. Matthew 29 : 19 : "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Heb. 10 : 22: "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed (that is, sprinkled) with *pure* water."

73. When was Christian baptism instituted?

It was instituted by our Lord after his resurrection, and before his ascension, when he gave the commission to go and baptize all nations.

74. What is its sacramental import?

It is the visible act by which a person is initiated into the visible Church of Christ; and it is a sign and seal of the covenant of grace.

75. Why is it said to be a sign?

It holds out to our view the provisions and promises of the covenant of grace. It is a most appropriate symbol of that influence by which the soul is cleansed from moral defilement. It is an acknowledgment of moral pollution; and also a recognition of God's tenderness, and of the efficacy of the blood of Christ to cleanse, and of the power of the Spirit to regenerate.

76. Why is it said to be a seal?

It is a visible pledge on the part of God that he will faithfully keep all his covenant engagements. Thus he binds himself by a perpetual ceremony. And when we look upon this visible pledge of his fidelity, our faith hears breathed through it, as through the trumpet of jubilee: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from

all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." (Ezek. 36 : 25.)

XIV.—The Subjects of Christian Baptism.

77. Who are proper subjects of Christian baptism?

It is commanded that all nations — all the world — every creature, should be baptized. The minister of Christ is commissioned to baptize all. All should be baptized, and made disciples of Christ, and trained from childhood in the way that they should go. Matthew 28 : 19, 20 : "Go ye and teach (that is, *make disciples* of, as it reads in the margin) all nations : (first by) baptizing them (into the faith, and then) teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

78. Upon what conditions may unbaptized adults receive Christian baptism?

By becoming like little children. *Children are the New Testament standard.* It is not he who believes the doctrines of any particular church or creed that shall be saved, but he that becomes like a little child. Little children are made partakers of grace and heirs of heaven, through the atonement of Christ. Unbaptized and unrenewed adults can only attain unto like precious grace and heirship *through faith* in Christ. When they exercise faith they are made free from condemnation, as children are, and being thus like unto them, they are proper subjects for baptism. Mark 10 : 14–16 : "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not : for *of such* is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child he shall not enter therein." This does not refer to children that are old enough to sin, for all such do actually become transgressors, and our Lord would not make sinning children a Christian standard. "He took them up *in his arms*," and must have set them down upon his knee, for he put both "hands upon them, and

blessed them." Ye must become like little, unsinning children—humble, teachable, trustful. Luke 18 : 15–17 : "And they brought unto him also infants, that he would touch them. Jesus said, Of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein."

79. Upon what ground is it affirmed by some that children should not be baptized?

It is said that children must not be baptized because they can not have faith. But faith is not required of them, for of this they are incapable. If this plea were valid it would shut infants out of heaven. Our Lord has positively declared : "He that believeth not shall be damned." Abraham received the initiatory rite, admitting him into the Church of God, because *he had faith.* Isaac was admitted to the same privilege when he was eight days old, without faith, for of this he was incapable.

It is also urged that infants ought not to be baptized, because they can not consent to the covenant of which it is the seal. But it is universally acknowledged in the transactions of daily life, that children are bound by the acts of their parents. It is done in various pecuniary transactions, in acts of civil legislation, and in the conveyance of real estate. Thus men bind themselves, their heirs, and assigns, forever. The sacred word shows that not only parents, but their *little ones*, may enter into covenant with God. Deut. 29 : 10–12 : "Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your *little ones*, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp : that thou shouldst ente into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into hi oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day."

80. What evidence can be adduced to show that infants should be baptized?

1. Our Lord has commanded that *all should be baptized*

and children form a part of the whole. This command was given by one who was a Jew, and who understood all their laws and customs. When Gentiles had been proselyted and embraced the Jewish religion, the laws and customs of the Jews required that they should be circumcised, including children down to the age of eight days. And now that a new initiatory rite is substituted for circumcision, and a command given, "Go and disciple or proselyte *all*, and baptize them," they must have understood it to include children. If Jesus had said, "Go, make disciples of, or proselyte all, and circumcise them," would the apostles have doubted whether children were to be circumcised? And when baptism is made the sign instead of circumcision, why should any doubt whether children are to be baptized? If our Lord did not wish infants to be baptized, existing circumstances made it necessary that he should expressly forbid it, and he would have done so, openly and definitely.

2. Man's wisdom suggests that infants should not be baptized because they can not understand the design of the rite, or make any profession of their faith. But man's wisdom is not as God's wisdom. God in his wisdom provided that the sons of Jews and proselytes should be circumcised when eight days old, and when they knew not the intent and meaning of the ordinance. The analogy must have been very clear to the first Christians, and to the Apostles, who were themselves Jews.

3. As Jewish proselytes were baptized in the time of Christ, and long previous thereto, and as it was universally known that infants eight days old were baptized, as well as adults, *would it not be natural*, as there was no prohibition of the baptism of infants, that *the Apostles should continue this practice?* Our Lord, with a full knowledge of these facts, says, Go, and *make disciples of all, and baptize them*, and he gave them no instruction to act differently from the prevailing custom. Surely if he had designed them to adopt a plan so peculiar and novel, as the exclusion of infants would be, he would have said so.

4. As our Lord has commanded that all should be baptized, infants should receive that ordinance, because *the only period* in life in which it is possible that this command *can be universally obeyed is in early infancy.* If baptism be denied to little children, then, it is inevitable that of those who are "forbid" thus to come to Christ, a large majority, perhaps more than seventy-five persons out of every hundred will pass through life, and go down to the grave, forever unbaptized.

5. Infants should be baptized because of *the importance of water baptism.* In John 3 : 5, it is said : "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." God in his wisdom has not only made water baptism important, and required it of all, but has also indicated the period in which it should be administered to the subject, namely, in early infancy. Those parents who do not suffer little children thus to come to Christ, and those teachers who forbid them thus to come, assume the awful responsibility of rejecting the only possible period in which *all can be* "born of water," and of sanctioning a system the tendency of which is to send the great majority unbaptized into eternity.

6. Persons should be baptized in infancy because God has *fixed the order* in which this should be done. The command says, "Go ye and make disciples of all," by, *first*, "baptizing them," (Matt. 28 : 19 ;) and then, after they are baptized, "teaching them (verse 20) to observe all things." *First*, baptize them as soon as they can be baptized, and *then* teach them as soon as they can be taught. It is sometimes affirmed that children should be left to grow up to mature years, and choose for themselves respecting these things. Such teaching is unscriptural, unphilosophical, inconsistent, mischievous, and most perilous. The guardianship of childhood involves the responsibility of training up children in the way they should go, irrespective of any consent or choice on their part; and the Head of the Church says, do this by first baptizing them, and then teaching them.

7. God has in his Church, from the beginning, *included the children* in his covenant with the parents, and made them members of his Church. Gen. 17: 7: "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee." In speaking to Noah, God said, Gen. 7: 1: "Come thou and *all thy house* into the ark, for thee have I seen righteous." *Thee* have I seen righteous; therefore, come, not only thou, but all thy house. Though many persons regard as foolishness the recognition of infants in connection with any religious rite or obligation, because of their want of comprehension, yet what is the foolishness of men is the wisdom of God. In God's plan infants have never been overlooked, or unprovided for. When God orders the assembling of the people, the children are not excluded because they do not understand. He says: "Assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breasts." (Joel 2:16.) Infants have ever been objects of his tenderest solicitude. He made them heirs of heaven, until they rebel by *actual transgression*. The great Shepherd has never forgotten the lambs; he gathers them in his arms, and carries them in his bosom. It is not like him to *cast them out* from among his people, or *thrust them from the pale and privileges of his Church*.

8. The *Church of God is one*, and has been one, from Abraham until now. The Church is now built on the same foundation as at the first, having the same chief corner-stone. God has made a covenant with the Church, and it is an "everlasting covenant." The Church has now the same Head and the same spiritual requirements as when David sang and Abraham believed in God. God's law provided that children should be admitted into the Church by its initiatory right. *That law has never been repealed, and must stand good until God himself repeals it*. Children, therefore, by his covenant have the right of initiation into the Church. It was not necessary that this should be specially affirmed in Christ's day, any more than it was that the ten commandments should be reënacted; it was then well understood and

acted upon. The obligation to keep the Sabbath-day holy, and to keep all the ten commandments, as well as the obligation to receive infants into the Church, is binding without special reënactment, because *these enactments were never repealed.* Paul, moreover, says (Gal. 3 : 14) that "the blessing of Abraham," an important part of which consisted in the covenant connection of his children, had "come on *the Gentiles* through Jesus Christ." Peter, speaking (Acts 2 : 38) of the double baptism of water and of the Spirit, says : "The promise is unto you, and to *your children*, and to all that are afar off."

9. Infants should be baptized because of *their Church relation.* "Children are related to the Church, spiritually, really, vitally. It is no figure of speech, but a first truth in the divine economy. When our Lord said, 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven,' he affirmed a spiritual relation. He did not predicate their membership in his kingdom of the simple fact of their baptism, or their circumcision, but of their being redeemed children. Their relation to the 'kingdom' arose from their relation to the King, and it applied to all children as such. Baptism is only the sign and seal of membership; the spiritual relation, which is the real one, precedes the emblematic and the conventional, and is the moral ground of the latter." When our Lord says, (Matt. 18 : 5,) "Whoso receiveth one such little child in my name receiveth me," he completely identifies little children with himself, and his spiritual family, the true Church. In Mark 9 : 41, the phrase "in my name" is explained to mean, "because ye belong to me." This is decisive of the sense. On no other ground could they be received in Christ's name. And this he affirms of little children, such as one could hold in his arms, as Christ thus held that little one. As they belong to the "general assembly and Church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven," in "the Lamb's book of life," as they are spiritually, really, vitally, related to the Church, they are

entitled to baptism, the visible sign and seal of that relationship.

10. Apostolic practice shows that infants should be baptized. In baptizing families, the Apostles acted according to the provisions of the existing covenant. It was the apostolic custom to baptize the children immediately after the baptism of the parents, as is indicated by the fact that there are eleven instances recorded in the New Testament in which infant baptism is involved. The familiar way in which these instances are mentioned suggests the probability that infant baptism was by no means an unusual thing in the Christian Church, and that many families were baptized in the same way.

11. Our Lord says: "Of such is the kingdom of God." By taking infants in his arms, and publicly recognizing them as subjects of his kingdom, *he* certainly *authorized the application of the distinguishing symbol* of that kingdom. Can any adult believer give any better evidence of being worthy of this ordinance than Christ has given of the worthiness of infants? An adult professor may be *untrue* and *unworthy to be baptized into the kingdom*, but the great Head of the Church gives the most positive evidence of the fitness of infants for baptism, for to such the kingdom of God belongs. Can there be any mistake when he speaks? What more than this do we need? There is reason and propriety, therefore, in dedicating them to God in the ordinance of baptism. Why should we deny them the seal when Christ has declared them entitled to the thing sealed?

12. Infants should be baptized because *they are justified* by the blood of Christ. Through him grace flows to all children. Faith is not required of them because they can not exercise it, and they are saved without it. The infant stands in the same relation to God that the adult Christian does. It has a moral fitness for baptism and Church relations. If the infant dies in infancy, it will as surely go to be with Jesus as the dying saint of riper years. Then the infant is truly a member of Christ's *invisible* Church, and it has therefore the same claim for admis-

sion to the *visible* Church that the believing adult has, namely, justification through the blood of Christ. Can you exclude them, then, and be guiltless? Nay, it is your imperative duty to bring them unto Christ in baptism, that they may be admitted to the visible Church of Christ, and "forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God."

81. Have you any additional proof to sustain the doctrine of infant baptism?

Yes. The following collateral evidence helps to establish the validity of infant baptism:

1. The teachings of the immediate successors of the Apostles show that infant baptism was handed down from them. Irenæus was one of the early fathers. He was the pupil of Polycarp, who was the disciple of John the Evangelist. He was born near the close of the first century. His writings show that infant baptism was an ordinance of the Church in his day.

Justin Martyr was cotemporaneous with Irenæus, and the first man of great learning who adorned the Church after Paul. He wrote about forty years after the apostolic age. In his writings he speaks of persons of seventy years of age who were made disciples in their infancy, and therefore received infant baptism. Justin Martyr had a dialogue with a celebrated Jew, and in it Justin compares baptism with circumcision. He declares that "*they are alike* in their nature and use." He says all are permitted to receive baptism, and none are excluded on account of their age. And as baptism came in the place of circumcision, infant baptism must have been an ordinance of the Church.

After these men came Tertullian and Origen, who were both young men when Irenæus and Justin Martyr died. These witnesses both speak of infant baptism as having universally prevailed in the Church from the Apostles' day. Tertullian urged the "delaying of baptism" until just before death for certain reasons, but speaks of it as the well-known and general practice of his day. He writes of infants of a "guiltless age," who

"can not of themselves" come to Christ, and "know not whither they are brought when they are brought to baptism." Origen speaks of himself as having been a baptized child. He was a very learned man. He travelled extensively among the churches. His father had died a martyr for Christ. Timothy and Titus had lived with the Origen family many years. Infant baptism was of almost daily occurrence, and common to the Church in every place. If infant baptism were a delusion, where were Timothy, and Titus, and Polycarp, and Irenæus, that they did not expose the error everywhere prevailing in the Church? Origen says, in his Homily Eighth, on Leviticus, chapter 12: "According to the usage of the Church, baptism is given to infants." In his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, book 5, he says: "For this cause it was that the Church *received an order from the Apostles to give baptism even to infants.*" And he specially speaks of those infants who have never committed any actual sins.

"In the time of Cyprian, in the third century, there arose a controversy concerning the day when the child should be baptized, whether or not before the eighth day. But there was no question about the point whether children ought to be baptized — in this they were all agreed."

Thus do those who sat at the feet of the Apostles and earliest fathers testify to the validity of infant baptism.

2. That infant baptism was the universal practice of the Church from the days of the Apostles is strongly corroborated by the fact that for hundreds of years next after their day, there was no sect or schism in the Church that did not practise it; and from the fifth century to the present time, in every period, it has been observed by the greater part of the Christian Church.

3. The history of the Church furnishes no satisfactory evidence of this practice having ever crept in. If infant baptism had sprung up as *a new doctrine* or practice, it would have arrested the attention of the historians of the Church. There is no trace of opposition to the first

practice of infant baptism. There can be no time mentioned in which the baptism of infants was first introduced after the death of the Apostles. There is no written record to show that it was introduced as a novelty among Christians, and we have therefore the strongest reason to believe that this practice has come down to us from the days of the Apostles.

4. The Catacombs of Rome furnish evidence indicating that infant baptism was practised by the Apostolic Church. Long before the beginning of the Christian era, excavations for building-stone were made near where Rome now stands. In the course of hundreds of years they became a net-work, extending from fifteen to twenty miles under ground. Cicero, in his oration for Cluentius, speaks of them. For the first three hundred years after Christ, these recesses were the burial-place of the entire Christian population of Rome. There the Christians dwelt during the persecutions in the first age of the Church. Jerome visited them about the year 300, and calls them "the sepulchres of the apostles and martyrs." Here, in those dens and caves of the earth, were the doctrines and teachings of the Apostles preserved in their primitive simplicity and purity. The relics and inscriptions found there indicate that infant baptism was an established ceremony among them. In those catacombs there are numerous epitaphs of children who are called "faithfuls" and "neophytes," which titles could not have been applied to them unless they had been baptized. The age at which they died shows that they were baptized in infancy. Some of these epitaphs read as follows: "The tile of Candidus, *the neophyte*, who lived twenty-one months; buried on the nones of September." "Flavia Jovina, who lived three years and thirty days—*a neophyte*." "Leopardus rests here in peace, with holy spirits; having received baptism, he went to the blessed innocents. This was placed by his parents, with whom he lived seven years and seven months." "Bufilla, newly baptized, who lived two years and forty days."

5. The evidence is abundant, specific, and certain that

Christ, when he instituted the new dispensation, did not deprive infants of the ancient privilege which belonged to children when the Gospel was preached to Abraham. Not one word of evidence can be adduced from the Scriptures, or the history of the Church for the first four hundred years, to prove that infants ought not to be baptized. It is alike unjewish and unchristian to refuse them the initiatory rite of the Church.

6. The Head of the Church has seen fit to make baptism occupy an important place in his economy of salvation, and he has not shut the children out. This ordinance belongs to them. Through the grace of the Lord Jesus, infants belong to his kingdom. Can we, then, rightly refuse them the sign and seal of their relationship and heirship? There were disciples who rebuked those who brought infants to Christ during his sojourn on the earth, and it was *just like him* to be displeased with them. How much alike is human nature in every age! There are disciples *now* who rebuke those who bring them. With such disciples the Master can not but be displeased. Can you stand between those little children and their privileges and be blameless? And if ye have done this wrong to one of these little ones, does not the Judge of all the earth say: *Ye have done it unto me?*

XV.—Circumcision and Baptism.

82. What relation has baptism to circumcision?

Baptism occupies the place under the evangelical dispensation that circumcision did under the Levitical.

83. By what evidence can you sustain that position?

1. Baptism does for us what circumcision did for the Jews.

2. Persons were initiated into the Jewish Church by the rite of circumcision. Persons are initiated into the Christian church by the rite of baptism.

3. The only way of admission into the Church of God, under either dispensation has been by circumcision in the one case, and by baptism in the other.

4. Circumcision and baptism are both alike, the outward, visible sign of the same inward, spiritual grace. The Apostle Paul speaks of baptism as being evangelical circumcision, in Gal. 3 : 27, 29: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

XVI.—Mode of Christian Baptism.

84. What is the Scripture mode of Christian baptism?

Affusion. This is apparent from its emblematical import. It is the symbol of certain gospel blessings, which are repeatedly spoken of under the figure of sprinkling or pouring, and never under that of immersion. The prophet, speaking of the Messiah, says, (Isaiah 52 : 15 :) "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." If this promise refers to the influences which Christ bestows upon the nations of the earth, "through the redemption of his blood" called "the blood of sprinkling," then these gracious influences are designated by the term *sprinkling*, and baptism, the outward sign, should surely correspond with it. Or, if this promise refers to the admission of persons into the Church by the ordinance of baptism, it fixes the mode to be *affusion*, and not immersion. The prophet does not say: So shall he immerse many nations.

85. What term is employed in the New Testament to denote the manner of the application of the blood of Christ?

The term sprinkling. Paul says, (Hebrews 12 : 22 :) "Ye are come . . . to the blood of *sprinkling*, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." And Peter speaks (1 Peter 1 : 2) of the same "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." If, through the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, moral cleansing is effected, then the outward ordinance of baptism, which is the symbol of this inward cleansing, should correspond thereto in form.

86. Was immersion practised by the Apostles and by the Apostolic Church?

There is no evidence that it was. The word *baptizo* was evidently used to denote only the ordinance of baptism, without reference to the mode. Baptism is an emblem of the purifying influences of the Holy Spirit; and the grand and leading emblem of purification instituted by Jehovah himself is *sprinkling*. Immersion is never foretold by the prophets, but sprinkling is, and that too as connected with the new dispensation. When immersion is practised the water is sometimes inevitably *far from being pure*, whereas "pure water" is indispensable in this symbolical washing. Sprinkling is more simple, more in accordance with the whole spirit of the New Testament, and an ordinance of universal adaptation. In the Jewish ceremonies, although the blood was sometimes poured out at the base of the altar, and sometimes smeared on its horns, or on parts of the person for whom expiation was to be made, yet the grand significant emblem was *sprinkling*. The whole nation was familiar with the idea that where there was sprinkling there was mercy. Sprinkling and mercy, in the great heart of the nation, were linked together. When the whole nation was consecrated to God at Sinai, Moses *sprinkled all the people*, (Hebrews 9 : 19.) On the great day of atonement the High-priest entered the most holy place, and *sprinkled* the Ark of the Covenant, (Leviticus 4 : 17, and Hebrews 9 : 25.) Paul and Peter both speak of the blood of *sprinkling*. Sprinkling throughout all the Bible is the symbol of mercy and blessing. Where the blood of the sacrifices was sprinkled there was mercy. When the destroying angel passed over Egypt, there was mercy where the blood was sprinkled. There is no evidence in the word of God that this ancient sign of mercy and blessing and cleansing was discarded, when Christian baptism was instituted. There is no reason why this long-familiar, well-understood, and God-established symbol should be discarded, and immersion substituted. "There are three," says the Apostle, (1 John 5 : 8,) "that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: *and these three agree in one*." As the

Spirit bears witness through the mode of affusion—*falling upon*—and as the blood bears witness through the mode of affusion—*being sprinkled*—so should the water bear witness *in the form of affusion*, for God's design is that these three should bear witness in earth, and that these three should agree in one. The testimony in favor of sprinkling is clear and irrefutable. It is the Bible mode. It is a form instituted by Jehovah himself, was practised throughout the Jewish dispensation, was adopted by John the Baptist, and was practised by the Apostles and the primitive Church. Immersion never was the scriptural symbol of mercy and blessing and cleansing, and can nowhere be found in the Bible as an ordinance, either implied, acknowledged, sanctioned, or commanded.

87. When was immersion introduced as a mode of baptism?

The practice of immersion was probably introduced in an early age of the Church. Some men are so organized mentally that they are prone to yield an undue regard to *forms* and *ceremonies*, and hence the practice was introduced and persisted in. Men of the purest motives sometimes run into extremes. In Paul's day members of the Christian Church adopted a strange error concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. They probably argued that if a little wine and a little bread are good in this ordinance, a little more must be better, and so they ate and drank to excess. And men were just as likely to err in reference to the sacrament of baptism. If a little water is good, more must be better, the wisdom of this world would suggest. Some minds are so peculiarly organized, that they can never understand what good a little water can do sprinkled on a person's head, but imagine there is special virtue in the grosser form of immersion.

XVII.—Philip and the Eunuch.

88. Do the Scriptures indicate the mode in which Philip baptized the eunuch?

The narrative shows that Philip and the eunuch

were riding in a certain desert together, and they conversed about a particular portion of Isaiah's prophecy which the eunuch had been reading. He did not understand the teaching of the prophet, (Isaiah 52 : 13, etc.,) who spoke of One whose visage was more marred than any other man, who was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and who was to "*sprinkle many nations.*" Philip began (Acts 8 : 35) at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus. They came to a certain water in the desert, and the eunuch wanted to be baptized, for he had just been reading about baptism—"so shall he sprinkle many nations." There was nothing in the prophecy he had been reading to lead him to think of immersion. He had been reading and speaking about *sprinkling.* The prophet foretold that Messiah must sprinkle many nations. That prophecy must be fulfilled, though Jesus "baptizeth not, but his disciples." They both went down into and came up out of the water—that is, more correctly, they went *to* and came *from* the water. But if we take the passage as it reads, it does not say he *immersed* him. Many persons have gone down into the water a thousand times, and have come up out of it as often, and not once gone under the water.

As the Scriptures indicate that the eunuch was sprinkled, so does common-sense suggest the same fact. If immersion were required, would not Philip have desired him to wait until the chariot would arrive at a stopping-place, and facilities be procured for attending to such a work? Is it probable they would engage in an act that would involve the necessity of continuing their journey, one man wet all over, and the other man half wet? Why this inconvenient wetting? Was ever that thing so done since? Who ever saw a parallel to that scene as immersionists paint it? But if the thing done by Philip were sprinkling, as the prophet had foretold, and about which they had been reading and speaking, there was no difficulty in the way.

XVIII.—The Jailer of Philippi.

89. How was the jailer of Philippi baptized?

He was baptized in the night, and in the prison. (Acts 16 : 24–34.) If the parties concerned had left the prison, to attend to that ordinance, the jailer would have been guilty of violating the laws of his country, and the most sacred duty of his office, and Paul and Silas would have been involved in the act. Moreover, Paul and Silas would have been liable to the charge of hypocritically pretending, when morning came, that they had not been out of the prison, for they refused to leave it, until the magistrates should come and take them out. The inference is inevitable that his baptism must have been by affusion.

XIX.—Buried by Baptism.

90. What does the Apostle mean by being "buried by baptism"?

He is speaking not of symbolical baptism, which is with water; but of the real, essential baptism, which is with the Holy Ghost.

91. How do you prove that?

The whole passage with which those words are connected shows that he does not allude to *natural things*, but *spiritual*. "How shall we," says he, (Romans 6 : 2,) "that are *dead* to sin?" He does not refer to a physical condition of himself and his brethren, when he says "*we that are dead*," but to a *spiritual*. Ye that "were baptized into Jesus Christ," does not mean a physical act — *into water*, but a *spiritual* baptism "*into Jesus Christ*." Therefore we are buried with him by baptism *into death*—not buried in baptism into water, nor into the grave, but *into death*. There is no allusion here to water baptism, nor to its mode. The Apostle is speaking of *spiritual* death, burial, resurrection, and life. He speaks also in the same place of our being *planted* together in the likeness of his death, and of our old man "being crucified with him." If the baptism mentioned

be a literal burial of the body in water, we should adopt the same interpretation in reference to the planting and crucifixion, and be literally planted and crucified. Besides, to follow the figures literally, the person should be put under *and left there.* This alone is burying and planting. But, no, the whole passage has a *spiritual*, not physical, significance. Being "baptized into his death" can not mean a physical act, because there is no similitude between being put under water and being hung upon a cross, between the heavens and the earth, to die.

92. Does Paul teach the same doctrine elsewhere?

In the Epistle to the Colossians, (chapter 2 : 10–12,) Paul corroborates what has just been affirmed. He also shows that the circumcision of which he speaks and baptism are one; but this is the circumcision *made without hands*, and *by which circumcision* "ye are buried with him in baptism," and not by water. This is not water baptism, then, but that baptism of the Spirit which is "through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

Romans 6 : 3 : "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized unto Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" That is, as many as were united to Christ, by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, were made partakers of the benefits of his death.

1 Cor. 12 : 13 : "For *by one Spirit*," not by water, "are we all baptized into one body," that is, "baptized into Jesus Christ."

Romans 6 : 11 : "Likewise, reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Can water baptism, then, accomplish the great moral change to which the Apostle here alludes? If we interpret these passages to refer to physical acts, they involve us in difficulty. That interpretation would favor the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. But every thing is plain, and consistent, and beautifully significant, if we suppose him, in speaking of being buried into Christ's

death, and being planted, and crucified, and dead, and yet alive, to refer, not to the outward man, but to the hidden man of the heart; not to physical, but to spiritual things.

XX.—Israelites baptized unto Moses.

93. What is meant by the Israelites being baptized unto Moses?

The Apostle alludes especially to the *import* of baptism. They were *consecrated* unto Moses, when passing through the sea, and took him as their leader and guide.

94. How were they baptized?

It could not have been by immersion. Immersion means being dipped, or plunged, or overwhelmed in a fluid until covered by it, and they passed "*on dry ground* through the midst of the sea," (Exodus 14 : 16.) A man can not be immersed on dry ground. They were baptized by affusion, for "*the heavens dropped*," "the clouds *poured out water*" upon them, (Psalm 77 : 17.) The people of God who went over "dry shod," and upon whom the sprinkling rain fell were, Paul says, *the baptized people.* The hosts of Pharaoh were *immersed*—they were buried in a "liquid tomb," but they were not baptized.

XXI.—Noah and the Ark.

95. What do you understand by what Peter says of baptism in connection with Noah?

He probably refers to the baptism of Noah and his family, or the ark, or both conjoined. In either case, there was not immersion, but there was affusion. The rain fell upon them. They were sprinkled. The wicked inhabitants of the world were immersed. Those who were sprinkled were baptized, and had mercy. Those who were immersed "went down into a watery grave" and perished. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us," *not the outward rite*, which is the putting off the filth of the flesh, but the inward or spiritual operation, through which we are purified, so as to live with a good conscience toward God, (1 Peter 3 : 21.)

XXII.—Paul and Apollos.

96. Do the facts recorded in the New Testament, concerning Paul and Apollos, throw additional light on the subject of baptism?

Paul stands out preëminently the model minister of the New Testament. The great theme of his preaching was, not Christ and *him baptized*, but Christ and him crucified. Apollos, when a young man, did not understand the things of God as well as Paul. He was eloquent, however, and mighty in the Scriptures, and being probably trained in the school of John, he went preaching in the synagogues, "knowing only the baptism of John," (Acts 8 : 25.) When Aquila and Priscilla heard him they "took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly."

Paul says, (1 Corinthians 3 : 6,) "I have planted, Apollos watered." This language implies that immersion could not have been the mode in which Apollos baptized, and that the mode must have been sprinkling, or pouring. Paul never would have used such a figure if Apollos had immersed the people. He was too correct a writer for that. An unbiased mind would naturally infer that those plants were watered by affusion. No gardener ever waters his plants by immersion. There is no evidence to indicate immersion here.

Apollos appears to have made the subject of water baptism too prominent a topic in his preaching. Paul, on the contrary, "determined not to know any thing among them, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." "Christ sent me," says he, "not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Again he says: "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius. And I baptized also the household of Stephanus," (1 Corinthians 1 : 14–16.) What a rebuke there is in these words for those whose one peculiar and distinctive theme is the baptism of water! No such preacher could adopt the language of Paul, after a successful and glorious ministry, as his had been at Corinth, and say: "I thank God I have only baptized two of you, and the family of another."

XXIII.—He that believeth and is baptized.

97. What is the obvious teaching of the word of God in the passage in Mark, (chapter 16 : 16 :) "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"?

If an unbaptized person is born again through faith in Christ, he is a proper subject for water baptism; but if he *is already baptized* he should not receive that ordinance again. It is not anywhere said in God's word that water baptism must come after believing in Christ. It is not, he that believeth and *shall be* baptized, but "he that believeth and *is* baptized." If one *is* already baptized, when he becomes a believer, that is sufficient. Nor was it taught by John that *his* baptism should be preceded by faith. John did not require a profession of faith of his disciples. They were baptized upon repentance and the confession of sin.

The reasoning that requires water baptism to follow the act of faith is unsound, and if adopted will lead into serious errors. This theory involves the idea that the one act of faith, through which the individual is accepted of the Father, secures his eternal salvation, and meets the claims of the word of God. But the divine testimony is, *not* he that believe*d*, on some particular occasion, shall be saved; it is rather, he that believe*th*—he that *has* faith, and *continues to have it*, shall be saved.

It does not follow because one had faith *yesterday* that he therefore has faith *to-day*. Faith should be an act of the heart, as regularly repeated as is the rising of the sun. There should be the forth-putting of the hand of faith — the confidently taking hold of the hand of God *every day*, and all the year round. If water baptism must *follow* the act of justifying faith, then, as that faith should be an every-day work, repeated baptisms would be required of every Christian. He who becomes a believer in Christ may be asked if he *is baptized*, and if that rite *is* performed, whether before or after he is renewed by the power of the Holy Spirit, through faith, the law in the case is met. "He that believeth and *is baptized* shall be saved."

XXIV.—The Immersionist Creed Inconsistent and Narrow.

98. Wherein does the immersionist creed agree with, and differ from, that of the Christian Church generally?

They agree in affirming that by baptism we are initiated into the visible church of Christ. The immersionist creed differs from all others in affirming that no person should be baptized but a believing adult, and that there is no baptism without immersion.

99. What is the logical inference deducible from the dogma of the immersionists?

If the immersionist creed were true, there never has been a visible Church of Christ on the earth except Baptist churches. All those in other churches who were faithful followers of Christ, and who nobly served their Master, and who triumphed over sin and over the world through faith, and whose robes were washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb, have been *stamped by the immersionist creed with the brand of excommunication;* for, says that creed, they were too early brought to Christ if they were brought when little children, and they never received baptism if they were not immersed. A creed which inevitably excludes such persons from the visible Church, is manifestly inconsistent and narrow.

100. Has the peculiar doctrine of the immersionists been believed by any considerable portion of the Christian Church?

Only a small fraction of the Christian Church ever believed their dogma. The great body of divines who have been eminent for piety and learning and genius, and whose writings have graced the literature of the ages, has been radically opposed to the peculiar doctrine of the immersionists—namely, that only adults should be baptized, and that there is no baptism without immersion.

101. Is the immersionist creed in accordance with the genius of Christianity?

The immersionist creed is antagonistic to the genius of

Christianity. It says: We are right; all who differ from us are wrong—we only are the Church of Christ, there is no visible Church but ours, for none can enter the Church but in our way. All ye great and good men of the past, says that creed, who imagined ye were in Christ, and who lived and died in the faith of Christ; ye pillars of the Church of England, Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer; ye princes of the Presbyterian Church, Calvin, Knox, Chalmers; ye eloquent divines of the Independent Church, Baxter, Howe, Watts; ye noble spirits of the Methodist Church, Wesley, Whitefield, Asbury; ye faithful children of the cross, who pined in inquisitions, and who died for Christ at the martyr's stake; and ye nameless ones who sleep in unremembered graves, the immersionist creed hath denied you the fellowship of the saints! It matters not that ye had faith in Christ, that ye had been converted, that ye were new creatures in Christ Jesus, that ye had been baptized with the Spirit, and that ye had been baptized with water—if ye were not *immersed in water*, all else is vain, ye were not in the visible Church of Christ. Stand ye aside! we only are in the Church, and immersion is the door! Such are the inevitable teachings of the immersionist creed. It is therefore obviously antagonistic to the whole spirit, and scope, and breadth of Christianity, and to the plain teachings of the Bible.

102. Are immersionists as inconsistent and narrow as their creed?

Immersionists are better than their creed. Their creed is opposed to the fellowship of the saints, but they love the brethren in Christ. Their creed is Roman Catholic where it requires the rebaptism of those who would come into their fold from other churches; but they are Protestant, for they say: "No matter—ye are Christians, though ye were never immersed." Their creed, if it be consistent with itself, *must be* "close-communion;" but they love Christians of every name. Their creed excommunicates the seraphic masters of spiritual song, Charles Wesley and Isaac Watts, because they were never immersed; but they have admitted their hymns to church

fellowship with them, and made them the vehicle of praise and supplication in all their churches. Their creed excludes children from the privileges and pale of the Church on earth; but they testify, when these are taken away by death, that they belong to the Church of the first-born whose names are written in heaven. Their creed is inconsistent, unscriptural, and behind the age, and all *intelligent immersionists* have outgrown it. In every recognition, by an immersionist, of a Christian of a different faith and practice, as a brother in the Church of Christ, there is an admission of the inconsistency of their creed. In every instance in which an immersionist church has abandoned the close-communion idea, and in every effort to do so, there is an acknowledgment of the unsoundness of their creed. In the recent attempt, by many of the most learned men in Baptist churches, to publish and circulate a new version of the Scriptures, ignoring the old landmarks, and substituting phraseology that will teach immersion, there is the confession, on the part of those Baptist scholars, that our good old English Bible—the Bible of our fathers, and of Protestantism, *does not teach the doctrine of immersion*, as they desire the Bible should teach it.

A CATECHISM OF BAPTISM.

SECOND PART.

XXV.—Positions Defined.

103. Is further inquiry into the baptismal question desirable?

The points upon which the Christian Church is divided on the subject of baptism are important and vital. Further discussion is therefore indispensable. If the immersionist creed be true, there are no baptized persons except those who have been dipped; and there are no Christian churches except immersionist churches; and there are no Christians except those persons who have been dipped upon a profession of faith.

104. Has inquiry on this subject in the past been profitable?

Yes. Information has been elicited. Some long-cherished errors have been abandoned. It is settled that Christian baptism was instituted after the resurrection of Christ, and before his ascension. Immersionists now admit that infant baptism was practised long before the errors of popery appeared, and in the times of Tertullian, who was born in the year 160. Immersionists also admit that infant baptism was practised in the Catacombs of Rome, where dwelt the persecuted Christians of the earliest ages of the Church.

105. Will you mention some of the points still open to discussion?

1. Immersionists regard the Greek word *baptizo* as

the chief corner-stone of their temple. The defenders of the immersionist dogma affirm that it has "one meaning, and only one meaning." Some immersionists, however, affirm that it means to dip, and nothing but to dip. Others declare, with equal emphasis, that it means to plunge, and nothing but to plunge. Others, again, contend that it signifies to immerse, and that only. And these, without appearing to perceive that they contradict each other, vehemently protest that it has one, and only one meaning. The Baptist *Confession of Faith* affirms that "baptizing is dipping, and dipping is baptizing." If this salient point of the immersionist stronghold can be carried, the whole fabric will fall.

2. Affusionists, on the other hand, affirm that the Greek word *baptizo* has various meanings, and that no necessity has existed to prevent it from being used, as other words, with different significations. It is contended, also, that baptizing is not dipping, and that dipping is not baptizing. Baptizing is more than dipping. The word baptize carries a far richer freight of meaning than the word dip. Objects may, therefore, be dipped without being baptized. It is believed, by affusionists, that to baptize is more than to plunge, or to immerse, or to sprinkle, or to pour upon; and that the immersionist creed, which restricts the signification of the word *baptizo* to "one meaning, and only one meaning," and which fails to recognize the wealth of meaning which is included in the words baptize and baptism, is radically defective.

106. What writers have in late years taken a prominent position on the immersionist side of this controversy?

Gale, Booth, Hinton, Carson, Robinson, Noel, Curtis, Chase, Pengilly, Conant, Jewett, Cramp, and others.

107. Do these immersionist writers agree among themselves?

No; they frequently, under a logical pressure, contra-

dict each other. There is among them a want of accordance with principles.

108. What do you infer when immersionist writers disagree, on the most important points, with themselves and with each other?

That in the immersionist creed there are radical errors, and that further investigation is needed.

109. Which of the afore-mentioned writers may be taken as a representative of the whole school?

1. Rev. J. M. Cramp, D.D., late President of Acadia College, Nova Scotia, who has reviewed the first part of this work, in several communications in the *Christian Messenger*, of Halifax, Nova Scotia, and in a work called a *Catechism of Christian Baptism*.

2. Dr. Cramp's *Catechism* has received high commendation from leading immersionist divines, and has been republished by the *Baptist Board of Publication*, Philadelphia. The usual immersion arguments are given in a condensed form. Perhaps no immersionist writer has succeeded in defending his creed more successfully than Dr. Cramp has done in his recent publication. If the arguments advanced by Dr. Cramp will not bear the test of criticism, the immersionist treasury can furnish no weapons of attack or of defense more formidable.

XXVI.—Immersionist Stratagem.

110. Do immersionists quote other divines in support of the immersionist creed?

Immersionist writers sometimes give extracts from others who are prominent affusionists, which appear to favor the immersionist idea; and these extracts being disconnected from the context, have frequently misrepresented the views of their authors.

111. Can you mention an immersionist writer who does thus mislead?

Dr. Cramp selects from some divines a sentence or

more that appears to favor his theory. He conceals what the writer says in immediate connection with the part quoted, and which explains or qualifies it, and thus misrepresents his author.

112. What authors does Dr. Cramp thus misrepresent?

John Wesley, Isaac Watts, Adam Clarke, George Whitefield, Thomas Chalmers, Martin Luther, and others.

113. In what position does Dr. Cramp attempt to place those authors?

He attempts to show that they believe the immersionist creed, although, during all their ministerial career, their practice was antagonistic thereto.

Dr. Cramp does not appear to have remembered that, if his accusations against the brethren whom he has named were well founded, any testimony from men whose faith and practice would be so completely contradictory as theirs is misrepresented to have been is utterly worthless.

114. Will you mention some instances to show how Dr. Cramp misrepresents those whose opinions he professes to give?

1. Dr. Cramp quotes (*Catechism*, page 40) from Dr. A. Clarke's Notes on Rom. 6 : 4: "It is probable that the Apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under the water." In Dr. Clarke's Notes the word "probable" is given in italics, though not so quoted by Dr. Cramp.

Dr. Clarke adds an important qualification to the above passage, which Dr. Cramp carefully omits: "I say it is *probable* that the Apostle alludes to this mode of immersion; but it is not absolutely *certain* that he does so, as some do imagine; for in the next verse our being incorporated into Christ by *baptism* is also denoted by our being *planted*, or rather *grafted together in the*

likeness of his death; and Noah's ark, *floating* upon the water, and *sprinkled by the rain from heaven*, is a figure corresponding to *baptism*."

2. Dr. Cramp says, (*Correspondence Christian Messenger*, February 22d, 1865:) "He" (Stewart) "asks for one instance of dipping. Let him read the New Testament. Every record of baptism in that book is an instance of dipping, as John Wesley, and ministers of all Christian denominations, have again and again confessed."

115. How does it appear that Dr. Cramp misrepresents Mr. Wesley?

1. In Mr. Wesley's Journal there are some statements which indicate that he, on a few occasions, either immersed persons or was present when some persons were immersed. The Journal, however, does not tell us that Mr. Wesley supposed he had authority for such a practice in the Bible, but that such a practice was taught in the Prayer-Book of the Church of England, and by the custom of the Church.

2. Mr. Wesley says, in his Journal: "On Saturday, 21st February, 1736, Mary Welsh, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the first Church, and the rule of the Church of England, by immersion. The child was ill then, but recovered from that hour."

3. It is important to observe that Mr. Wesley here refers to what he understood the custom of the first Church to have been, and the rules of the Church of England. Mr. Wesley, at the period mentioned, (1736,) had not learned to take the Bible as a rule of his life in preference to the rules of the Church. His theological views and his plans of ministerial labor were subsequently subjected to revision and modification.

4. Dr. Cramp points to an act alleged to have been performed by Mr. Wesley in the year 1736—several years before the rise of Methodism, and before his con-

version—and asserts that Mr. Wesley was an immersionist. A just representation of Mr. Wesley's creed can only be had by reference to his words and his deeds written and performed after his heart had been renewed through the grace of the Lord Jesus, and his mind had been enlightened through patient research and study of the oracles of God. Dr. Cramp, however, seizes on an isolated instance or two, and suppressing most important particulars, he misrepresents him whose opinions he professes to give.

116. Can you mention another instance of Dr. Cramp's disingenuous style?

Dr. Cramp says, (*Correspondence Christian Messenger*, March 28th, 1866:) "A neighbor of mine who writes in the *Provincial Wesleyan* under the signature of *Veritas*, endeavors to be facetious on the Wesley-and-dipping question. He flatters himself that he has gained an advantage, and imagines that the great John's 'misrepresented words' will be expunged from the title-page of my Catechism. Veritas is mistaken. The discussion has brought out three facts. First, that John Wesley, as a minister of the Church of England, was an immersionist: he was a minister of that Church, I believe, when he died."

117. What peculiarities are prominent in this quotation from Dr. Cramp?

1. Dr. Cramp misrepresents Mr. Wesley. He insinuates that Mr. Wesley was a Church of England minister until his death; and was, as such, an immersionist. Mr. Wesley's life-long practice, and his published writings, show that Dr. Cramp's misrepresentation of him is neither accurate nor candid.

2. Dr. Cramp's misstatements are calculated to mislead. A misstatement may be much more mischievous because there is a small amount of truth in a large amount of error. It is unnecessary to elicit evidence to show the disingenuousness of Dr. Cramp, who has taught

his readers that Mr. Wesley was an immersionist, as a minister of the Church of England, and was such "when he died."

3. If Mr. Wesley had been an immersionist in theory, as he is misrepresented to have been, and an affusionist in practice, as he was, it seems surprising that Dr. Cramp should have honored him with a conspicuous place by the side of Paul on the title-page of his *Catechism*. No jury would receive testimony from one whose faith and practice were known to be as contradictory as Mr. Wesley's is said, by his accuser, to have been. It is possible that Dr. Cramp has not paused to measure the extent of the accusation involved in his ungenerous misrepresentation of him against whom he has borne such incorrect witness.

118. Can you show by Mr. Wesley's writings that Dr. Cramp misrepresents him, when he says that John Wesley "was an immersionist;" and that "John Wesley has again and again confessed that every record of baptism in the New Testament is an instance of dipping"?

Yes. Mr. Wesley published a *Treatise on Baptism* in November, 1756, (Works, Vol. 6, page 12.) He says:

1. "Concerning baptism, I shall inquire what it is. It is the initiatory sacrament which enters us into covenant with God. . . . It was instituted in the room of circumcision. For as that was a sign and seal of God's covenant, so is this. . . . It can not be certainly proved from Scripture that even John's (baptism) was performed by dipping. . . . Nor can it be proved that the baptism of our Saviour, or that administered by his disciples, was by immersion. No, nor that of the eunuch baptized by Philip; though they both went down to the water: for that going down may relate to the chariot, and implies no determinate depth of water. It might be up to their knees; it might not be above their ankles.

2. "And as nothing can be determined from Scripture

precept or example, so neither from the force or meaning of the word. For the words *baptize* and *baptism* do not necessarily imply *dipping*, but are used in other senses in several places. Thus we read that the Jews 'were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea,' (1 Cor. 10 : 2 ;) but they were not plunged in either. They could therefore be only sprinkled by drops of the sea water and refreshing dews from the clouds ; probably intimated in that, 'Thou sentest a gracious rain upon thine inheritance, and refreshedst it when it was weary.' (Psalm 68 : 9.) Again, Christ said to his two disciples, 'Ye shall be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with,' (Mark 10 : 38 ;) but neither he nor they were dipped, but only sprinkled or washed with their own blood. Again, we read (Mark 7 : 4) of the baptisms (so it is in the original) of pots and cups, and tables or beds. Now, pots and cups are not necessarily dipped when they are washed. Nay, the Pharisees washed the outsides of them only. And as for the tables or beds, none will suppose they could be dipped. Here, then, the word *baptism*, in its natural sense, is not taken for dipping, but for washing or cleansing. And that this is the true meaning of the word *baptize*, is testified by the greatest scholars and most proper judges in this matter. It is true we read of being buried with Christ in baptism. But nothing can be inferred from such a figurative expression. Nay, if it held exactly, it would make as much for sprinkling as for plunging ; since, in burying, the body is not plunged through the substance of the earth, but rather earth is poured or sprinkled upon it.

3. "And, as there is no clear proof of dipping in Scripture, so there is very probable proof of the contrary. It is highly probable the Apostles themselves baptized great numbers, not by dipping, but by washing, sprinkling, or pouring water. This clearly represented the cleansing from sin, which is figured by baptism. And the quantity of water used was not material ; no more than the quantity of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. The jailer 'and all his house were bap-

tized' in the prison; Cornelius with his friends, (and so several households,) at home. Now, is it likely that all these had ponds or rivers in or near their houses sufficient to plunge them all? Every unprejudiced person must allow the contrary is far more probable. Again, three thousand at one time and five thousand at another were converted and baptized by St. Peter at Jerusalem, where they had none but the gentle waters of Siloam, according to the observation of Mr. Fuller, 'There were no water-mills at Jerusalem, because there was no stream large enough to drive one.' The place, therefore, as well as the number, makes it highly probable that all these were baptized by sprinkling or pouring, and not by immersion."

119. What do you infer from Dr. Cramp's style of controversial writing?

1. The inference appears inevitable that if Dr. Cramp, having read Mr. Wesley's works on baptism, supposes him to have been an immersionist, he could make the same mistake in reference to Paul, or any other of the sacred writers, and misconceive that they were immersionists.

2. It may also be inferred that if Dr. Cramp imagines that such men as Watts, Whitefield, Chalmers, and Luther, who, during all their ministry, administered baptism in the mode foretold by Ezekiel, (36 : 25,) "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," were immersionists because, occasionally, a sentence flowed from their pens which had some resemblance to immersionist theology, he might also presume that the Bible contains some immersionist theology, because there is, here and there, a passage which seems to look somewhat in that direction.

3. It may be inferred, moreover, that a creed which requires its ablest advocates to resort in its defense to a style of argumentation so disingenuous as that which Dr. Cramp employs must be radically unsound. The assertion of Dr. Cramp that Mr. Wesley was an "im-

mersionist," and that he "again and again confessed that every record of baptism in the New Testament is an instance of dipping," is absurd, ungrounded, and illusory. Dr. Cramp's assertion is disproved by the evidence adduced. The truth never asks its defenders to misrepresent its assailants. If the immersionist creed were true, it would not make demands upon its expounders so extravagant and humiliating. Dr. Cramp appears to have looked through a very deceptive medium, by which facts appear very much as a landscape appears in a mirage, turned upside down and variously distorted.

XXVII.—Paul and Regeneration.

120. Does Paul indicate the agency through which the regeneration of the heart is effected?

Paul teaches that through the agency of the Holy Spirit one is renewed, becomes dead to sin and alive to Christ, becomes a member of Christ's spiritual body and one with him, and that he is thereby washed from his sins. Paul does not teach that the *symbolical* baptism, which is with water, can change the heart. It is the *real baptism* of the Holy Spirit that works this wondrous renewal.

Romans 6 : 3, 4 : "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ (by the Holy Spirit) were baptized into his death? (not into water.) Therefore we *are* buried (not *have been* buried) with him by baptism into death."

Colossians 2 : 10–12 : "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power: in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, (that is, not in water, but through the baptism of Christ by his Holy Spirit, and *without hands*,) wherein also ye are risen with him through (not the

hands of any man, but) the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

121. What is the immersionist exegesis of the passages just quoted?

Immersionists teach that the great change of heart indicated in those passages is accomplished through immersion in water; that one is baptized into Jesus Christ, and into his death, by immersion in water; that immersion in water is meant by the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, and burial with Christ, and being risen with him.

122. What radical error is apparent in the immersionist exegesis?

1. The immersionist exegesis of the passages under consideration teaches the doctrine of regeneration through the baptism of water, whereas the Bible teaches that regeneration can only be effected through the work—the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

2. Immersionists misconceive the design of the Apostle, who does not, either in the passages just quoted, or elsewhere, attribute to the baptism with water a renewing or regenerating power. Paul attributes the washing of regeneration to the Holy Ghost which had been abundantly *shed upon* them.

123. Can you quote some passages from writers who have held the immersionist theory, and who have supposed that the spiritual regeneration of which Paul wrote is effected through the baptism of water?

1. Dr. Cramp gives some specimens in his Catechism:

Ambrose: "In the font there is a transition from the earthly to the heavenly. This is the passover, that is, the sinner's passing-over—the passing-over from sin to life, from guilt to grace, from pollution to sanctification." (*Cramp's Catechism*, p. 26.)

Chrysostom: "Christ has given baptism as a kind of antidote against poisons; and so all malice is ejected, and the fever is quenched, and the putridity dried up.

We are clayey before baptism: after it, we are golden." (*Cramp's Catechism*, p. 26.)

Jerome: "In the laver the old Adam altogether dies, and the new one is raised up, together with Christ; the earthly perishes, and the super-celestial is born." (*Cramp's Catechism*, p. 26.)

Paulinus: "O wonderful mercy of God! The sinner is plunged in the waves: presently he emerges from the water, justified." (*Cramp's Catechism*, p. 26.)

Bede, (called "The Venerable":) "He who is baptized is seen to descend into the font; he is seen to ascend out of the water; but what the laver of regeneration performed in him is not seen at all. It is known only by the piety of the faithful. He descends into the font, a sinner; but he ascends, purified. He descends, a child of death; but he ascends, a child of the resurrection. He descends, a child of rebellion; but he ascends, a child of reconciliation. He descends, a child of wrath; but he ascends, a child of mercy. He descends, a child of the devil; but he ascends, a child of God." (*Cramp's Catechism*, p. 26.)

2. *Campbell* (founder of the Campbellite sect) says: "So significant, and so expressive, that when the baptized believer rises out of the water, is born of water, enters the world a second time, he enters it as innocent, as clean, as unspotted as an angel."

124. Are the extracts just quoted fair representations of immersionist views?

They express the logical inferences which grow out of the immersionist exegesis of the passages from Paul which we have been considering. Immersionists are more evangelical than their creed. Dr. Cramp, and all evangelical immersionists, recoil from the extravagant lengths to which the logical inferences of their interpretations of Paul would lead them.

125. What appears to be the correct interpretation of the passages from Paul under examination?

They are to be interpreted as teaching that regeneration can be effected through the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which is the *real* and *essential* baptism; and not merely through the baptism of water, which is the shadow or the symbol thereof.

126. How can you prove that?

1. The Scriptures do not teach that water baptism can accomplish so great a result. The renewal of the soul is always represented in Scripture as effected by the power of the Holy Spirit, through the truth. Many good but mistaken persons have supposed that Paul teaches that this change is connected with being *buried under water*—with "a watery grave" or "a liquid tomb." Immersionist theology teaches it. Paul never taught it. God does not teach it. Neither does the Hebrew, nor the Greek, nor the English Scriptures (except the new Baptist version) teach that water can work that marvelous renewal of our nature. That is God's work; and it can only be wrought through the baptism "made without hands."

2. That Paul did not refer to the symbolic baptism is evident from the fact that many have received water baptism in whom no such change as Paul indicated was produced. Many who have had water baptism have still remained in the "gall of bitterness," and unrenewed in heart. Hence we infer that it is not through water that one is buried into Christ's death, and is regenerated, but through the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

3. The effects of the real baptism were apparent on the day of Pentecost, when the promise made at the time of the ascension was fulfilled, (Acts 1 : 5, 8 :) "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. . . . Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." Here a real change of condition was effected. They received power. Water never could have produced such a result. They became, after that baptism, different men. They were not, as they had been, the weak and vacillating disciples; but

bold witnesses of Christ's power and truth. This is the *real, essential* baptism. This is what Christ does for us. We are made "complete," not in water, but in him.

4. Bishop Morriss, (Methodist Episcopal Church:) "The next argument is raised from the doctrinal references to the action of baptism used by Paul, Romans 6 : 1–11. It is thought to be very plain from this text that water baptism is designed to represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and therefore the subject must be immersed. We reply: (1) Is there any mention made of water here? Not any; and if there was, and that for the purpose, as you suppose, of representing the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, what then, we ask, is the Lord's Supper intended for? We have always supposed, with the Christian world generally, that the Lord's Supper was designed to show forth his death, or what he had done *for us* by redemption, and water baptism to show what he does *in us* by his Spirit; but, according to your system, we have two sacraments to represent his sufferings for us and none to represent his grace in us! If we were to administer the Lord's Supper only as an emblem of conversion, we should pervert the ordinance, and destroy its original design; and when others administer baptism, as an emblem of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection, do not they pervert this ordinance, and destroy its original design? Certainly. Then administer as you will, but refer it to its proper object. (2) Every burial implies three things, namely, an agent, an action, and an object acted upon; but here the agent is baptism—'buried by baptism'—the action is burial, and the object is the subject interred. And what is the nature of this death, burial, and resurrection? Answer, it is a death and burial unto sin, and a resurrection unto 'newness of life.' Then whatever baptism Paul here speaks of, it is that which produces in believers a death unto sin, or a change from sin to holiness; for this is the subject of his argument. And what baptism is it that converts the soul? Answer, the baptism of the Holy Ghost;

and this is, therefore, the baptism which Paul here speaks of, where his design is to prove that, as Christ died for sin, we must die unto sin; and as Christ rose again, so we must rise with him to newness of life. Hence, this proves nothing in regard to water baptism, inasmuch as it says nothing on the subject. The case in Colossians, 2d chapter, is similar, and the argument need not be repeated."

5. J. H. Godwin: "Christians are circumcised with Christ—they are consecrated and cleansed by their union to Christ—being buried with him in baptism, and raised with him through their faith in God. (Col. 2 : 11.) As the circumcision and crucifixion are spiritual, so the burial and resurrection are spiritual: and the baptism here referred to must be spiritual also; and exclusively so, if there be consistency in the use of the terms and correctness in the statements. All who have this baptism do seek to be like Christ. For them there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. This is the baptism which St. Peter declares does save; that which is, not a cleansing of the body, nor a correspondence to the destructive flood; but the pursuit of a good conscience, the antitype to the example of Christ, who once suffered for sins, the just on behalf of the unjust, that he might bring us to God, whose pattern of self-denial and suffering all are called to imitate. It is simply an assumption, without the least support either from the New Testament or from the Old, that, in these figurative expressions of the Apostles, any reference is made to immersions in water, such as were subsequently introduced. For these there is the authority of the Fathers of the third century, but not that of the Apostles of Christ. The purifications required by the Jewish law, in connection with the temple service, are called baptisms. (Heb. 9 : 10.) But no immersion of the body in water is commanded or mentioned in that law. Every purification with water, of one person by another, was by sprinkling. . . . All the evidence brought forward respecting the practice of immersion, by Jews or by

Christians, is of a date comparatively recent, when superstitious customs were multiplied, and the traditions of men were regarded more than the commandments of God."

John 13 : 8: "Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me."

Acts 15 : 8, 9: "And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith."

1 Peter 1 : 22: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently."

Titus 3 : 5, 6: "According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."

1 Cor. 12 : 13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body."

XXVIII. — Immersionists and the Greek Word *Baptizo.*

127. What positions are assumed by immersionist writers in reference to the Greek word *baptizo?*

1. That through all Greek literature the word *baptizo* has but one meaning; which meaning is definite, clear, precise, and easy of translation.

2. That the word *baptizo* expresses an *act*, a definite act; and mode, and nothing but mode—*to dip.*

3. That *baptizo* has the same meaning in figurative as in literal use, always referring to the act of dipping.

128. Will you mention some of the definitions of the word *baptizo*, as given by immersionist writers?

Roger Williams, 1644. "It means to dip, and nothing but to dip."

A. R., 1644. "Dipping is baptizing, and baptizing is dipping."

Dr. Gale, 1711. "Dipping only is baptism."

A. Booth, 1711. "The primary sense of the term is to dip."

F. A. Cox, 1824. "The idea of dipping is in every instance."

Dr. Carson, 1853. "My position is, that it always signifies *to dip;* never expressing any thing but mode."

Dr. Fuller, 1859. "Dip, sink, plunge, immerse."

Dr. Conant, 1860. "This verb *baptizo* has, in fact, but one sole acceptation. It signifies literally and always *to plunge*."

Dr. Cramp, 1866. "Every body admits that the natural meaning of the word is *to immerse*."

Baptist Confession of Faith. "Baptizing is dipping, and dipping is baptizing."

129. What points of importance are specially apparent in the definitions of immersionist authorities as just quoted?

1. That the word *baptizo* is claimed by immersionists to have in all the range of Greek literature one meaning, and only one.

2. It is claimed, with great unanimity, that the word *baptizo* expresses the action of putting under water; and that action only.

3. It is affirmed that the word *baptizo* does not express *the condition* of being under water.

130. What important distinction do we need here to keep in sight?

1. Our investigation demands that we must not lose sight of the difference between the *action* of putting under water, and the *condition* of being under water. A word that expresses such an *act*, and a word that expresses such a condition, are separated from each other by an essential difference of nature. They belong to different classes of verbs. These two views do not coincide

in one clear and precise meaning, but are essentially diverse and irreconcilable. Dip has a development growing out of its peculiarities as an act; immerse has a development which is based on condition. These terms, therefore, are not synonymous. "I have been dipped into water;" "I was immersed in water;" express ideas essentially diverse. The structure of language is controlled by such differences. Dip expresses the course of action by which one was put into water. Immerse says nothing about the course of action, and only indicates the condition of being under water. It is important not to confound act and condition, and not to treat one word as though it expressed both act and condition, or at one time act, and at another time condition.

2. We may affirm that the word *baptizo* has not been used to express the contradictory qualities of action and condition. It is apparent that immersionist writers agree in claiming for that word the meaning of action, and that alone. Words that express action and condition belong to two distinct classes. Each class has its own deeply marked and broadly distinguishing characteristics. The word *baptizo* can not belong to both these classes.

131. Why is it important to keep these points prominently in view?

The whole immersionist structure depends upon these special points. If it can be shown that the word *baptizo* expresses the *action of putting under* water, and that action definitely, precisely, and clearly, and that action only, as immersionists claim, then their position would seem to be impregnable. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that the word *baptizo* expresses *condition* instead of action, the immersionist fabric has not a single prop upon which to stand.

XXIX.—Meaning of Words.

132. Before passing on to the further investigation of the word *baptizo*, will you state the peculiar assumption

of immersionists in reference to the one meaning of words, and especially the word *baptizo?*

Immersionists affirm (*Cramp's Catechism*, page 31) that "every word has one natural, obvious, original meaning, which will be applied to it by all readers or hearers, and with which it will be used by speakers and writers. From that natural and primary sense other acceptations or uses may branch out, but they will imply or include the original idea." In accordance with this opinion, it is claimed that the word *baptizo* has "just its own meaning, and no other;" namely, the action of putting under water. (*Cramp's Catechism*, page 32.) The exigency of the immersionist creed demands that with unfaltering pertinacity this position must be retained.

133. Is that theory correct?

The most eminent scholars have given testimony, clear and abundant, that words may have various and sometimes opposite significations.

134. Can you furnish evidence to sustain that view?

1. W. P. Strickland, (*Manual of Biblical Literature*, pp. 57–60:) "Words, considered simply as sounds, have no meaning; for they are not the natural and necessary signs of things, but conventional ones. Usage or custom has constituted a connection between words and ideas. The connection between words and ideas is now rendered necessary by usage, whatever may have been the case at first. This does not mean, however, that a word may have only one meaning, for usage contradicts this. Usage, which is the law of language, has gradually assigned many meanings to the same word, lest words should be indefinitely multiplied, and the difficulty of learning a language become too great. The way to determine the *usus loquendi* is by taking into account the religion, sect, education, common life, civil affairs, etc., all of which have an influence on an author's language, and characterize it. The same word is employed in one sense respecting the ordinary things of life; in another, respecting the things of religion; in another still, in

the schools of philosophy. . . . The interpreter is not to be guided in his work by the analogy of faith. . . . . With many, the analogy of faith is *all the rule* of interpretation they have; and this, instead of being a *scriptural* analogy, is nothing more or less than a *sectarian* analogy. . . . . With such, *the voice of their church* is the voice of God, and not the voice of the living oracles."

2. TRENCH, (*The Study of Words:*) "It will often happen that you will meet in books, sometimes in the same book, and perhaps in the same page of this book, a word used in senses so far apart from one another, that it will seem to you at first sight almost absurd to assume as possible that there can be any bond of connection between them."

3. SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON, (*Logic:*) "All languages by the same word express a multitude of thoughts more or less differing from one another."

4. C. H. SPURGEON, (*Excellent Thoughts for Young Ministers:*) "Rest assured, in Holy Scripture, the same word does not always mean the same thing."

135. What point is indicated by these quotations?

That the immersionist declaration that the word *baptizo* has one definite, precise, and clear meaning, and one only, is contrary to all experience; and improbable, if not untrue.

XXX.—CLASSIC BAPTISM.

136. What is the classic meaning of *Baptizo?*

The word *baptizo* in classic Greek has various significations; but whatever shade of meaning may be apparent, it always expresses *a change of condition.* This change of condition may be effected by various agencies and in different ways. But, whatever peculiarity of mode may have obtained, the use of the word *baptizo* always carries with it the idea of condition. It belongs to a clearly marked class.

137. How can you demonstrate the correctness of this position?

By appealing to any passage of classic Greek in which the word is used, there is at once a clear and adequate solution revealed.

138. How can you show that the immersionist theory of *a definite act* is erroneous?

By appealing in the same manner to any passage of classic Greek in which the word occurs, the *definite act* idea is found to be without foundation.

139. What becomes of the dipping theory when tried by the same standard?

1. If it be true that the word *baptizo* expresses always a *change of condition*, and not the action of putting under, then it is evident that the word *baptizo* does not express the idea of dipping.

2. *Immerse* and *dip* are interchanged at will and confounded together by immersionist writers. There is no valid authority for so doing. Dip performs an act that is transitory. It does not put its object in a new state or condition. We may speak of the laying of the Atlantic cable, which involved its immersion, but no person educated or uneducated would speak of "dipping" the Atlantic cable to the bottom of the ocean. If a portion of the earth had remained covered with the sea since the morning of creation, it can not be said to have been "dipped" all that time, though for thousands of years it may have been immersed.

140. By what peculiar modes may that change of condition indicated by the word *baptizo* be accomplished?

1. By plunging, or sinking, or overflowing, the essential demand of *condition* may be secured. An object therefore may be baptized (according to the authority of the classic Greek) by being plunged, or sunk, or overflowed.

2. The same authority shows that by pouring or

sprinkling, a *change of condition*, which the word *baptizo* expresses, may be effected. An object therefore may be baptized by being poured upon or sprinkled.

141. To what tribunal should we appeal that we may test the meaning of the word *baptizo?*

We should appeal to the tribunal of usage, which is of supreme authority, and the rule in the language. Usage is a higher tribunal than the authority of all critics.

142. What does usage suggest as the classical meaning of the word *baptizo?*

Usage shows that the word *baptizo* does not express a form of action, and therefore does not mean *to dip.* No immersionist writer has yet produced a passage from the Greek which shows that the word *baptizo* means *to dip.* The word *bapto* means to dip, but *baptizo* does not mean to dip; and it is the word *baptizo*—the word used in the Scriptures—whose signification is the object of inquiry.

XXXI.—Modes of Classic Baptism.

143. How do you ascertain the modes of classic baptism?

By consulting the Greek authors we ascertain in what sense the word *baptizo* was used by them, and what they meant by baptism.

144. Will you give some illustrations?

1. Strabo, (14 : 3, 9 :) "Alexander falling upon the stormy season and trusting commonly to fortune, pressed on before the flood went out, and through the entire day the army marched baptized (*baptizomenōn*) up to the waist."

This baptism was by *wading*, not dipping. The text shows that the army was in a certain state or condition—they were *wet* to the waist. The act that produced this wetting was that of *wading*, *passing through*, or technically marching. There was no dipping, or plunging, or burying, or watery grave, or liquid tomb here, and yet

there was a baptism. What becomes then of the immersionist chief corner-stone—"through all Greek literature the word baptize has *one meaning*, and that meaning is *mode*, and *nothing but mode*."

2. HELIODORUS, (*Æthiop.* 5 : 28 :) "Already being baptized, (*baptizomenōn*,) and wanting little of going down, some of the pirates at first attempted to pass into their own boat."

This baptism was by a storm dashing the waves and spray upon the vessel. There is no dipping here. There is no immersion. The ship had not gone down under the water, and yet there was a baptism.

3. DIODORUS SICULUS, (1 :) "Of the land animals a great part overtaken by the river are destroyed, being baptized (*baptizomena*) with water rushing on them."

There was no dipping or plunging of these animals into the water. The water rushed upon them; and they were baptized in that way.

4. DIODORUS SICULUS, (16 : 80 :) "The river rushing down with a strong current baptized (*ebaptize*) many with water."

The water rushed upon them. They were not dipped into it.

5. JOSEPH., (A. X. 9 :) "Baptized (*bebaptismenon*) by intemperance to insensibility and sleep."

He had not been made intemperate by being dipped, or plunged, or immersed into wine. His condition was changed by imbibing it, and this was called a baptism.

6. ALEX. APHROD. PROB., (2 :) "A force baptized (*bebaptismenē*) into the inward parts of the body."

The word baptized here is used in the sense of *diffused in*. This baptism was not a dipping.

7. JOSEPHUS, (De Bello 4 : 3 :) "Those indeed even without engaging in a faction baptized (*ebaptisan*) the city."

Josephus in the immediate context shows that this baptism means a *rushing or pouring in upon;* for he

says the inhabitants received them all, "thinking that all who *poured themselves in upon* the city came from good-will to help them." The city was not dipped into any thing, although it was baptized. There was no plunging or immersion of the city under water.

8. PLUTARCH, (Par. Gr. and Rom. 3:) "He gathers the shields of the slain foe, and having baptized (*baptisas*) his hand into the blood, he reared a trophy, and wrote upon it."

No passage can be quoted which affords a better foundation for the *dipping* theory than this. Out of more than one hundred passages there are only six besides this which Dr. Conant, an immersionist, translates *dip*. "That any Baptist writer thoroughly committed to dipping should be unable to introduce the word on which his system hangs in more than one passage in twenty is a fact which, of itself, suggests the gravest doubt about the justness of such a translation in any case."

As the passage just quoted from Plutarch is specially claimed to sustain the *dipping* idea; and as there is no other Greek passage for which the same claim can be urged with more plausible pretensions, it invites careful consideration. A Roman soldier is left wounded on the battle-field. He spends his failing strength in gathering the armor of his slain enemies to erect a trophy. In order that he may write an inscription, "he baptizes his hand into the blood." It does not follow that this baptism was a dipping. The current usage of the word does not require such a meaning, and will not warrant it. The attempt has been made to ally this phraseology with pen-dipping. In pen-dipping, however, the whole pen is not immersed; the point only is dipped in the ink. In this case it was not the point of the finger that was dipped into blood—the *hand* was baptized. It is not said that he wrote with the same *hand* that was baptized. It is quite possible, if not probable, that the blood was taken up with the baptized hand, by its being scooped up; and that from it the blood was taken by dipping the finger of the other hand into it, and thus

writing the inscription. And if he thus scooped up the blood in his hand, that would not be dipping. The hand may be introduced into a pool of blood in various ways other than by dipping.

9. Chariton Aphrod., (3 : 4:) "I saw a vessel wandering in pleasant weather, full of its own storm, and baptized (*baptizomenon*) in a calm."

There is no dipping here. The waves in a storm broke against the vessel. There was no immersion here; the vessel was not under the water; and yet she was baptized.

10. Libanius, (*Epist.* 25:) "And I am of those baptized (*bebaptismenon*) by that great wave."

No dipping here. No immersion here. The object was not plunged, nor dipped, nor immersed into the element. It is the element that moves to reach the object. And this is baptism.

11. Heimerius, (15: 3:) "Great at Salamis; for there, fighting, he baptized (*'ebaptise*) all Asia."

It would be difficult to dip "all Asia," or to plunge it, or to immerse it, into the waters of the Gulf Argolis. And yet it is said "all Asia" was baptized by fighting; that is, it was subjected to a new state or condition of things by a triumphant victory, which gave Greece a controlling influence over Asia. There was no dipping here, but there was a baptism. And baptism implies condition, and not necessarily any action or mode which secures that condition.

12. Libanius, (*Declamat.* 20:) "Salamis was the pinnacle of exploits; where thou didst baptize (*'ebaptisas*) Asia."

In this passage again it appears that baptism means an *effect* produced, and not an *act*. An immersionist writer (Gale) contends that a "lake was dipped in the blood of a frog," because he would not give up the position of "one meaning, and one meaning only, in the whole range of Greek literature," for *bapto*. Libanius

did not mean that all Asia was dipped, or plunged, or immersed, though he says it was baptized.

13. Plotinus, (*Ennead.* 1, 4, 9:) "But when he does not so continue, being baptized (*baptistheis*) by diseases, and by arts of wizards."

There is no dipping here. The man is not dipped into diseases, nor into arts. He does not lie on the sea-shore until diseases and arts roll over him, like the waves of the sea. The diseases, or the arts, or both, have affected the condition or state of the person, hence he is said to be baptized. The *action* belongs to the wizards, and the arts, and the diseases; the *effect* to the person baptized.

14. Plutarch, (*Galba*, 21:) "Knowing how to be licentious, and extravagant, and baptized (*bebaptismenon*) by debts of fifty millions."

This person was not dipped into the debts, nor did the debts dip him into or under water, or any thing else. The debts were a burden, a load upon him. He was not immersed in debts, but burdened by debts. He was baptized without being dipped, or plunged, or immersed under water.

Dr. Conant says: "The ground idea expressed by the word *baptizo* is *to put into or under water* . . . that this act is always expressed in the literal application of the word."

Dr. Cramp indorses Dr. Conant. Plutarch, however, did not so understand it. He, and the other Greek authorities, used the word *baptizo* where there is not even a shadow of the idea of being *put into or under water.* Plutarch thought men could be baptized by having debts pressing upon them.

15. Themistius, (*Oration* 20:) "But when she (Philosophy) sees me baptized (*baptizomenon*) by grief, and carried away into tears, she is displeased."

The object was not dipped by grief, nor into grief, nor into tears. The term "baptized by grief" expressed

among the Greeks a condition of sorrow; and did not convey the idea of action or mode.

16. Achilles Tatius, (*Leuc. and Clit.* 2: 31:) "But Leucippe had another chamber servant, whom, having baptized (*baptisas*) by the same drug, Satyrus comes to the door-keeper, at the third door; and him he cast down by the same potion."

In this passage there is shown a *condition* of stupefaction, to which one had been brought by a soporific drug, by which he was "cast down." There was a baptism, but that baptism did not imply action. The drug did not lay hold of the person and dip, or plunge, or immerse her. Nevertheless the immersionist creed claims that the word *baptizo* has "one meaning, and one only."

17. Athenæus, (*Philos. Banq.* 5: 64:) "You seem to me, O convivialists! to be flooded beyond expectation with impetuous words, and to be baptized (*bebaptisthai*) by unmixed wine."

This baptism expresses the condition of drunkenness through unmixed wine. This company of convivialists had not been dipped into unmixed wine. Nor were they immersed into unmixed wine, nor were they sunk in it, nor drowned in it. They were simply under the influence of wine. The word *baptizo* expressed the effect of the wine, and not the special mode in which the wine was applied or used.

18. Conon, (*Narrat. L.:*) "Thebe exhorted to the murder, and having baptized (*baptisasa*) and put to sleep Alexander by much wine."

This passage shows that the word *baptizo* here implies the condition of drunkenness. Alexander was made drunk, and put to sleep, by much wine. The immersionist creed, which contends that *baptizo* has *one meaning, and one only*, in all Greek literature, must, of course, declare that Alexander was dipped or immersed into the wine, rather than that the wine was poured into him. If "*baptizo* means mode, and nothing but mode," as immersionists affirm, of course Alexander was made

drunk by being dipped, or plunged, or immersed into his wine-glass, or his decanter, or his cask. The immersionist creed is inexorable in its demands, and however improbable or absurd those demands may be, its advocates must accept them, or abandon the field as lost.

The mode whereby this baptism was effected is indicated; not, however, by the word *baptizo*, but by the connection in which it stands. That mode was drinking. The mind and the body are baptized by drinking from the wine-cup. There was no immersion here, no dipping, no plunging; but simply the pouring the element into the mouth. He was subjected to a condition of drunkenness and sleep, through the mode of pouring.

19. Homeric Allegories, (p. 495:) "Since, now, a mass of iron, pervaded with fire, drawn out of the furnace, is baptized (*baptizetai*) by water, and the heat, by its own nature quenched by water, ceases."

This passage is claimed by immersionists as showing the plunging process. The grammatical structure of the sentence indicates that there is no plunging here. Of course water is capable of receiving hot iron by plunging, and hot iron is frequently plunged in water, but it does not follow that there is plunging in this case. The word *baptizo* does not express the idea of plunging. Hot iron may be wet or may be immersed without having been plunged. And the phraseology in this passage indicates the agency by which the result is accomplished, and not the element in which it is done. Hot iron may be brought into a cold condition by being plunged into water, or by having water poured over it, or by being sprinkled with water. It often happens that heated iron can not be physically plunged into water, or immersed, on account of its weight, or form, or because of some other peculiarity.

20. Plato, (*Euthydemus*, 7:) "I, knowing that the youth was baptized, (*baptizomenon*,) wishing to relieve him."

Cleinias, a youth, in company with some sophists, was

bewildered with a series of subtle questions. This bewilderment was called baptism. The young man was not dipped, nor plunged, into the questions addressed to him. There is no immersion into water here. He was in a condition of bewilderment, and Plato calls that a baptism.

21. PLUTARCH, (*Alexander*, 57:) "Soldiers baptizing (*baptizontes*) with bowls, and cups, and flagons, along the whole way, pledging one another out of large wine jars, and mixing vessels."

Plutarch refers to the riotous and drunken march of Alexander's army from their Eastern conquests, and to the fact that they had been made drunk by excess of wine. There was no dipping in this baptism; the wine was poured.

22. PLUTARCH, (*Water and Land Anim.*, 23:) "The nobleman being sober, as you see, and prepared, sets upon us, debauched and baptized (*bebaptismenois*) from yesterday."

In this passage a contrast is shown between one in a condition of sobriety, and others in a condition of inebriety. It is difficult to see how this baptism could have been dipping, or how those who were baptized from yesterday could have been immersed during that time, or could have been dipped during that time. The immersionist who can see a resemblance between the action of drinking and the action of dipping must look through a medium peculiarly his own.

23. PLUTARCH, (*Phys. Ques.*, 10:) "Why do they pour in beside the wine sea-water, and say that fishermen received an oracle, commanding to baptize (*baptizein*) Bacchus by the sea?"

As Bacchus has no personality, and is a representative for wine, this is a command to baptize wine. This passage shows that the wine was baptized by pouring the water into it. Water poured into wine would change its condition—take away its intoxicating quality. Such baptism is in perfect accord with the idea of baptizing hot

iron by pouring water on it; it brings it into a new condition. It is also in harmony with the exposition given of baptism by pouring wine into a man; it changes his condition; from having been sober he has become drunken.

24. PLUTARCH, (*Superstition*, 3:) "Call the purifying Old Woman, and baptize (*baptison*) thyself (going) to the sea."

This is a religious baptism. There is nothing in the passage that indicates the mode of action. The fact that the baptism was by the sea does not prove plunging, or immersion, or dipping in it; for Bacchus was baptized by the sea without either of those modes. The sea-water may have been used by sprinkling or pouring, or washing the hands, or by drinking, or in any other way by which religious purification would be secured. In Hindostan, Ganges water is put into the mouth of the dying as an act of purifying them for death. "There is nothing in classic usage to prevent *baptizo* meaning *to purify* by the sprinkling or drinking of sea-water, any more than to mean *to intoxicate*, or baptize, by drinking wine. Palinurus was baptized into sleep by sprinkling his temples with Lethean dew."

Plutarch says: "The priests in Egypt besprinkle themselves, not with *any* water, but with that of which they believe that Isis drank." Dale says, in his comment on this passage: "The term baptism is not applied to this transaction; but I affirm that a state of *complete purification*, induced by the sprinkling of *Ibis* water, is as legitimate and true a baptism, interpreted by classic Greek, as would be a state of complete covering of their bodies, by their being sunk to the bottom of the Nile. Sprinkling demands, not as of grace, but as of absolute right, the acknowledgment of its power to baptize."

145. What results are apparent from the examples adduced of classic baptism?

1. Usage, which is higher authority than lexicons or lexicographers, shows that the word *baptizo* has been

used, in the twenty-four instances cited, where it does not mean *to dip.*

2. Usage shows that the word *baptizo* does not, in the passages adduced, express *definite action* of any kind.

3. The word *baptizo* expresses a *change of condition*, either physical, intellectual, moral, or ceremonial.

4. The word *baptizo* does not indicate the *mode* by which the act of baptism is effected.

5. The word *baptizo* has many significations, adjusting itself to the most diverse cases.

6. The key whereby the word *baptizo* may be interpreted is *condition.*

XXXII.—Immersionist Inconsistencies.

146. Will you state some of the definitions given by leading immersionist authorities in reference to the word *baptizo?*

Baptist Confession of Faith: "Baptizing is dipping, and dipping is baptizing."

Alexander Carson, LL.D., *Baptist Board of Publication:* "To dip, and nothing but dip, through all Greek literature."

T. J. Conant, D.D., *Baptist Bible Union:* "*Baptizo* has, in fact, but one sole acceptation. It signifies literally and always *to plunge.*"

Dr. Conant, again: "The literal meaning of this word, its true and only import, is, *to immerse.*"

Dr. Conant, again: "To immerse, immerge, submerge, dip, plunge, imbathe, whelm."

Dr. Conant, again: "The meaning of the word was clear, definite, always the same, and one of the easiest words to translate."

147. Is Dr. Conant a recognized authority among immersionists?

Dr. Conant has labored in behalf of the "American Bible Union" in preparing for the press the new Baptist version of the Scriptures. He has been successful in making the new version teach, as no other version does, the dogma of immersion. He has bestowed great labor in collecting passages in Greek literature in which the word *baptizo* is found. And, though his reasonings have been inaccurate, and his conclusions erroneous, he has, nevertheless, contributed valuable materials, and has made them the subject of elaborate study. No writer has appeared in the immersionist school better qualified than he for the investigation of this subject.

148. What inconsistencies are apparent in the definitions just quoted?

1. The want of accord, apparent in the definitions just given, indicates that the immersionist theory, respecting the word *baptizo*, is inconsistent and erroneous.

2. Dr. Conant says, in one place: "*Baptizo* has, in fact, but one sole acceptation. It signifies literally and always *to plunge*." In another place, he says: "The literal meaning of this word, its true and only import is, *to immerse*." Here is a grave and fatal inconsistency. The words plunge and immerse are not synonymous. A ship may plunge among the waves, and not be immersed. An island may be immersed by being overflowed with the swollen waters of a river, without having been plunged. If the immersionist definition of *baptizo* were true, it would not involve such contradictions. The truth is never inconsistent with itself.

3. Dr. Conant, again, says: "The meaning of the word was clear, definite, always the same, and one of the easiest words to translate." And, in another definition, he says: "To put into or under water." If this word is so easy to translate, and has always the same clear, definite meaning, why does not Dr. Conant say whether it means *into* or *under?* Does he not know which? Or, does it mean sometimes one, and sometimes the other; without having a fixed meaning? Or, does

it mean both? Being *into* any thing, or *under* it, does not convey the same "one, clear, definite idea." Going *into* the water does not involve going *under* it. The immersionist rule of interpretation is seriously defective in its working.

4. If, as Dr. Conant says, the meaning of *baptizo* is "clear, definite, and always the same, and one of the easiest words to translate;" and if it means "to *dip*, and nothing but *dip*, through all Greek literature;" how are we to account for the fact that, in another definition, Dr. Conant gives the word *baptizo* seven different meanings? And if the first of those seven words is the "clear," "definite," and "sole acceptation" of *baptizo*, why are we to believe that the other six words are also, each, the clear, definite, and sole acceptation of *baptizo?* Or, if any *one* of those seven words is the clear, definite, and sole acceptation of *baptizo*, why give seven different words? The theory out of which grow such inconsistencies must be radically wrong.

149. What does Dr. Cramp affirm of the word *baptizo?*

Dr. Cramp says: "Every body admits that the natural meaning of the word is *to immerse.*" He also says: "No learned man will risk his reputation by affirming the contrary."

150. Will you give the testimony of some eminent scholar, to show the incorrectness and absurdity of Dr. Cramp's teachings?

Timothy Dwight, S.T.D., LL.D., *late President of Yale College*, says: "Concerning the former of these subjects I observe, that the body of learned critics and lexicographers declare that the original meaning of both these words (*baptizo* and *baptō*) is to *tinge*, *stain*, *dye*, or *color;* and that, when it means immersion, it is only in a secondary and occasional sense; derived from the fact that such things as are *dyed*, *stained*, or *colored*, are often immersed for this end. This interpretation of the

words also they support by such a series of quotations as seem unanswerably to evince that this was the original, classical meaning of these words.

"I have examined almost one hundred instances, in which the word *baptizo*, and its derivatives, are used in the New Testament, and four in the Septuagint; these, so far as I have observed, being all the instances contained in both. By this examination it is to my apprehension evident that the following things are true:

1. "That the primary meaning of these terms is cleansing; the effect, not the mode, of washing.

2. "That the mode is usually referred to *incidentally*, wherever these words are mentioned; and that this is always the case, wherever the ordinance of baptism is mentioned, and a reference made at the same time to the mode of administration.

3. "That these words, although often capable of denoting any mode of washing, whether by affusion, sprinkling, or immersion, (since cleansing was familiarly accomplished by the Jews in all these ways;) yet, in many instances, can not without obvious impropriety be made to signify immersion; and in others can not signify it at all."

XXXIII.—Testimony of Christian Greek Authors.

151. What testimony do Christian Greek authors give as to the meaning of the word *baptizo?*

The Greek Christians of the first century followed the sacred writers in their use of religious terms. An examination of their works will show that they used the word *baptizo*, when they did not mean to plunge, or dip, or immerse; but in the sense of affusion.

152. Will you give some illustrations?

1. Clement, of Alexandria, the most renowned Christian writer of the second century, says, (*Stromat. lib.* 4:) "And this it would seem is the image of baptism, (*bap-*

tismatos,) which from Moses has been handed down from the poets after this manner. Penelope,

'In waters washed, and clad in vestments pure,'

goes forth to prayer. But Telemachus,

'Laving his hands in the gray sea, to Pallas prayed.'

"This was the custom of the Jews, that they also should be often baptized (*baptizesthai*) on their couch." Clement could not have meant immersed, or plunged, or dipped on their couches.

2. ORIGEN, another Greek writer, of great talents and learning, uses the word *baptizo* to describe the pouring of the water upon the wood by order of Elijah. He says, (Comment on John:) "How came you to think that Elias, when he should come, would baptize, who did not in Ahab's time baptize the wood upon the altar, which was to be washed before it was burnt by the Lord's appearing in fire? But he ordered the priests to do that; not once only, but says, Do it the second time, and they did it the second time; and, Do it the third time, and they did it the third time. He, therefore, that did not himself baptize them, but assigned that work to others, how was he likely to baptize, when he, according to Malachi's prophecy, should come?"

Origen says that Elijah ordered the priests to baptize the wood; and by what mode was this baptism done? The inspired word says, (1 Kings 18 : 33:) "He put the wood in order, and cut the bullock in pieces, and laid him on the wood, and said, Fill four barrels with water, and *pour* it on the burnt sacrifice, and on the wood."

3. JOHN DAMASCENUS: "John (Baptist) was baptized (*ebaptisthe*) by placing his hand on the head of his divine Master, and by his own blood." Again, this writer speaks of "the baptism (*baptisma*) by blood and martyrdom by which Christ was baptized (*ebaptizeto*) for us."

4. ATHANASIUS mentions several baptisms, of which one is the baptism of Moses in the sea, another is the

ceremonial cleansing practised by the Jews, and another is the baptism of tears.

5. Gregory Nazianzen: "I know of a fourth baptism, that by martyrdom and blood; and I know of a fifth, that of tears."

6. Ambrose: "He who desired to be purified with a typical baptism was sprinkled with the blood of a lamb by means of a bunch of hyssop." Sprinkling with blood was a typical purification, but not a typical dipping or immersion.

7. If these learned fathers understood their own mother tongue, then the purifications practised by the pouring of water on the altar, and the falling of tears on the face, and the flowing of one's own blood upon a part of his body, were correctly called baptisms.

XXXIV.—The Baptism of Blood.

153. What is the testimony of the Scriptures, as to the meaning of *baptizo*, and the baptism of blood?

In this work it has already been shown, pages 13–16, that the word *baptizo* is sometimes used in the Bible when it could not possibly have meant to plunge, or dip, or immerse. Further testimony may be adduced to establish the same point. Additional proof is available to show that the Greek word for baptize, or baptism, is used in the New Testament, as well as in the Old, *as a religious act*, in the sense of purifying, or cleansing, or washing.

154. Can you give some illustrations?

1. Christ said to his disciples, (Luke 12 : 50 :) "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." This language will apply to his agony in the garden, when "his sweat was, as it were, great drops of blood;" and to the wounds inflicted on him, by which his sacred body was stained with blood. The early Christian writers abound with similar

phraseology in speaking of the martyrs who were, they say, "baptized with their own blood." This could not mean a plunging, or dipping, or immersion.

2. Some immersionist, or rather some plunging authorities, who make baptism always mean plunging, demand that "we must imagine a plunging even here." Immersionists, of course, bow to the demand. As it is asserted that baptism always means plunging, they must, therefore, "imagine" that our Lord, and the noble army of martyrs, must have been, each, plunged in his own blood. Others will rather say that the creed, whose demands are so humiliating to the logical sense, and to a discriminating imagination, must be unreasonable, and unworthy of acceptance. The plunging rendering of the passage just quoted is: "I have a plunging to be plunged with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished."

3. In Rev. 19 : 13, it is said: "He was clothed with a vesture dipped (baptized) in blood," that is, bespattered, sprinkled, spotted, or stained with blood. The vesture had not been plunged into blood, but blood had been shed upon it, and thus it was baptized with blood. This passage is precisely parallel to Isaiah 63 : 3 : "And their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment."

XXXV.—Religious Purification.

155. What relationship exists in the Scriptures between baptizing and purifying?

Baptizing, when mentioned in the Scriptures, as a religious act, signifies to purify, or cleanse, or wash; whether it be the baptism with water, or the real, inward purification of the Holy Ghost, of which water baptism is the outward symbol.

156. How can it be proved that the term purifying is synonymous with baptizing?

By comparing Scripture with Scripture, and allowing the Holy Spirit to be his own interpreter.

1. In John 3 : 25, it is said: "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying." The context shows plainly that the question was about baptism. The answer given by John to his disciples admits of no other interpretation.

2. If to baptize does not mean to purify, cleanse, wash, we can not understand the question which the Jews, who had come from Jerusalem, put to John, nor John's answer to it, namely: "Why baptizest thou then if thou art not that Christ?" It never had been predicted that the Messiah would immerse, but that he would purify.

Isaiah 52 : 15: "So shall he sprinkle many nations."

Ezekiel 36 : 25: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you."

Malachi 3 : 2, 3: "But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi."

Numbers 8 : 7: "And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them."

3. When the Jewish authorities, therefore, saw that John purified the people symbolically with water, and at the same time confessed that he was not the Christ, it was natural that they should ask John, "Why baptizest (purifiest) thou then?" John's answer is consistent with the import of the question, as if he had said: "Do not imagine that I am the great Purifier promised by the prophets: I baptize (purify) only with water, but he shall baptize (purify) with the Holy Ghost. He, and he only, can work in you a complete change of condition. He shall change the heart through the renewing energy of the Holy Ghost, and that is the real baptism."

4. The Old Testament service is described, in He-

brews 9 : 10, as consisting in meats and drinks, and divers washings (baptisms, in the Greek,) and carnal ordinances. These "divers baptisms" were purifications of various kinds—sprinklings and washings, of which the Apostle speaks in the context, (ver. 13:) "Sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh." Again, he says, (ver. 19:) "Moses . . . . sprinkled all the people." And again, he says, (ver. 21:) "Moreover, he sprinkled . . . . all the vessels of the ministry." And again, he adds, (ver. 23:) "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these." By allowing Scripture to interpret Scripture, and by examining the passages which prescribe these ceremonies, (see pages 6 and 7,) we find that these baptisms could not possibly, in any instance, have been by immersion, or plunging, or dipping, and that the baptism in Hebrews 9 : 10 does not mean immersion.

5. That baptizing is synonymous with purifying is further apparent from the teachings of Mark 7 : 3, 4; and Luke 11 : 38. In Mark 7 : 3, 4, it is said: "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash (baptize themselves) they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing (baptizing) of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables." In Luke 11 : 38, the washing of hands is called baptizing: "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he (Jesus) had not first washed (baptized himself) before dinner."

The word rendered "tables," in our version in Mark, means also "beds" or "couches." This is admitted by Dr. Cramp in his correspondence. (*Chris. Mess.*, *Feb.* 22, 1865.) The beds "were wooden structures, from eight to twenty feet in length, about four feet wide, and about three or four feet high." Horne says: "In later times their couches were splendid, and the frames inlaid with ivory, and the coverlets rich. On

these sofas, in the latter ages of the Jewish state—the very period to which this passage refers—they universally reclined when taking their meals."

6. The immersionist theory, which requires baptism always to mean plunging under water, requires all these persons, pots, brazen vessels, tables, beds, couches, etc., of all the thousands of Jewish families and households to be repeatedly plunged under water. This demand of the immersionist creed is extravagant and repulsive. In summer and in winter, in sickness and in health, their eating must be preceded by the inevitable and ever-recurring plunging of themselves, their beds, couches, etc., under water. No matter how improbable, or absurd, or unscriptural all this may be, immersionists must cling to their idea. They can not afford to allow that *baptizo* ever means any thing else but plunging under water. If that creed gives up one point, every thing is lost. Dr. Cramp perceives these difficulties that crowd around his creed, and condescends to bow to the absurdity of saying, (*Chris. Mess.*, *Feb.* 22, 1865 :) "In whatever way it may be translated, or whether we are to believe that 'beds,' 'couches,' or 'tables' are referred to, those articles were treated in the same manner as the 'cups, pots, and brazen vessels;' that is, they were immersed. They underwent a *baptismos*, and *baptismos*, as the Greek Lexicon (Liddell and Scott) says, and every scholar knows, means 'a dipping.'" That Dr. Cramp and his creed are both wrong is evident, first, from the inspired word, which shows that these baptisms were always performed by sprinkling; and secondly, from the law of common sense, which is never antagonistic to the law of God.

7. J. H. Godwin, (*Notes on Mark:*) "This (Mark 7 : 4) is one of the three passages in the New Testament which refer to Jewish baptisms, and show that, whatever may have been the primary meaning of the word, *it had become the name of a class of purifications*, distinguished by their importance, and not by the mode of

their performance. Nothing is more common in all languages than the change through new usages of the primary signification of words. From Hebrews 9 : 10 it appears that the *purifications appointed by law* for the service of the tabernacle were called *baptisms;* but none of these were immersions. Here the name is given to purifications of the person, observed by all the people of Judea when they came from the market; and to the purifications of couches also. But the practice of immersion is unmentioned, unparalleled, and almost impossible."

8. The Apocrypha of the Old Testament shows that to baptize and to purify are synonymous; and that to baptize could not mean to dip, or plunge, or immerse. The Apocrypha was written by Jews who were well acquainted with the personal washings prescribed in the ceremonial law, and who used the dialect in which the New Testament was written.

In Judith 12 : 7, it is shown, by the literal translation, that "she baptized herself in the camp, at a fountain of water." The context shows that "garrisons had been set over the fountain." There is no probability that this high-born, refined lady disrobed in the presence of the soldiers and immersed herself. She had gone to baptize as a preparation for prayer, and the custom of that people required, not immersion, but the washing of face, and hands, and feet only, as the baptism necessary for prayer.

In Ecclesiasticus 34 : 25, it is said: "He that baptizeth himself after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his washing?" Here *baptizo* is used in the sense of washing. A reference to the law for the purification of those who were defiled by touching a dead body shows that there was no plunging or immersion here, but that this baptism was by sprinkling.

157. How does it appear further that this purification does not mean immersion?

There is no passage of Scripture that indicates that immersion is a scriptural mode of purification or cleansing or washing; but numerous passages show that it is by affusion that this purification of both the bodies and the souls of men is accomplished.

XXXVI.—Naaman the Syrian.

158. How was Naaman, the leper of Syria, cleansed of his leprosy?

He was cleansed by observing the law specially appointed for such cases. (See pages 14 and 15.)

159. What was that law?

The law is found in Leviticus 14 : 7: "And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean."

160. Was there any other way of curing the leprosy?

There was only one way of curing the leprosy, and that was by following the divinely appointed directions. The leprous person must submit to God's plan, and be sprinkled seven times.

161. To whom did this law concerning the cure of leprosy apply?

To all who were afflicted with the disease, whether they were strangers or home-born, bond or free.

162. How can you prove that?

By passages of Scripture which show that God's laws were meant for general recognition and acceptance. Though the commandments were given in the midst of Israel, and specially for that people, yet they are meant for all. The leprosy of either body or soul can be cured in only one way—by special compliance with God's plan. There is no other way. This will apply to the stranger or the home-born, to the Jew or the Gentile. In Leviticus 24 : 22 it is said, after giving the law concerning various feasts, sacrifices, priests, murders,

sin-offerings, uncleannesses, and leprosy: "Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger as for one of your own country; for I am the Lord your God."

163. What does Dr. Cramp say of Naaman?

Dr. Cramp admits (*Cor. Chris. Mess.*, *January* 11, 1865, and *Catechism*, p. 72) that "Naaman was a leper," and that "lepers were cleansed by sprinkling." He evidently found the leper an unpleasant subject to handle, and was compelled to resort to some weak and transparent sophistry and special pleading. He says Naaman's cleansing was not "a legal cleansing; it was, so to speak, outside of the law. It is useless to say that 'no law required him to be immersed.' He was not cleansed according to the law, for he was not under it." "It was a case of miraculous interference above and beyond the law."

164. What proof does Dr. Cramp give to sustain his position respecting Naaman?

Dr. Cramp offers not one word of proof to sustain his assertion. He can not produce one word from the Bible to show that Naaman might be cleansed from the leprosy in a different way from any one else. The Bible reveals only one way. Though Naaman was a great man, he had to observe God's requirements if he desired and would secure his blessing. Though Naaman was not one of God's people, yet he went to an inspired servant of the Lord, whose duty it was to teach and to practise the law of God; and he went to him to be cured in the way that God's servant would direct. There was a well-known law that exactly met Naaman's case. He came as a stranger, it is true; but God had said, (Numbers 9 : 14 :) "Ye shall have one ordinance, both for the stranger and for him that was born in the land." There was no "miraculous interference above and beyond the law," as Dr. Cramp imagines; none was needed. An existing long-established law, applicable to "the stranger" and to "him that was born in the

land," exactly met the necessities of the case. Let Naaman "sprinkle himself seven times," and the wondrous power of God will be seen. This sprinkling is called baptism.

165. How do you prove that Naaman sprinkled himself seven times?

He was made clean; and the Scriptures show that his disease could not have been cured except he had been sprinkled seven times. In 2 Kings 5 : 14, it is said: "He dipped himself seven times." In the original Greek it is: "He baptized himself seven times." The inspired word shows that this baptism must have been sprinkling. Dr. Cramp asserts that he immersed himself seven times, because the Greek word used is *baptizo*. There could have been no cure for the leprous man if he had failed to sprinkle himself seven times, as God's law required.

166. Why does Dr. Cramp assume that there was an immersion here?

He can not help it. He must do that or give up his creed. He must contend that there was a miracle in the case, and that sprinkling, which was the established and well-known symbol of cleansing and blessing, must be set aside, and that immersion, a new mode, was in this case employed; or otherwise it would be apparent that sprinkling was the mode whereby Naaman was baptized.

XXXVII.—Greek Church Baptism.

167. What does Dr. Cramp assert concerning the Greek Church?

Dr. Cramp says, (*Catechism*, p. 45 :) "Has the Greek Church ever sustained sprinkling or pouring? No. I was about to say that this is remarkable. But it is not remarkable. The New Testament was written in Greek. In speaking of baptism the Apostles used the Greek word

baptizo. Christians nowadays differ in opinion as to the meaning of that word. What can be fairer than to submit the question to the Greeks themselves? They must surely understand their own language. Now the Greeks have always held baptism to be immersion, and they have practised accordingly. They do so to this day, even during the severity of a Russian winter. The Russians, you are aware, belong to the Greek Church."

168. Are Dr. Cramp's assertions true?

Dr. Cramp gives part of the truth and suppresses part when he says the Greek Church immerses and does not "sustain sprinkling or pouring."

169. In what way do the Greeks baptize?

1. They immerse three times and pour or sprinkle three times. They frequently dip their infants to the breast and pour water on the head.

2. Booth, (whose work Dr. Cramp recommends,) in his *Pedobaptism Examined*, quotes Deylingius: "So long as the Apostles lived, *as many believe*, immersion only was used, to which afterward, perhaps, they added a kind of affusion, such *as the Greeks practise at this day*, after having performed the trine immersion."

3. Huber says: "I resided upward of three years in the capital of the Grand Seignior's dominions, in a Greek family of the first respectability. During that time, I was present at four baptisms—two in the family and two in the immediate neighborhood. It is the custom among the Greeks either to have their children baptized publicly in their churches, or else in their houses; in which latter case the parents invite their nearest relations and neighbors; and after the ceremony, while refreshments pass round, the father gives to each person present a token of witnesship, consisting of a small piece of Turkish money, through which a hole is pierced and a piece of new ribbon inserted. I was thus invited to attend the four above-mentioned baptisms, and I still have in my possession two tokens; the other two may be seen

in Mrs. McDowall's museum in Danville. The company were all seated on the sofas around the room. A table stood in the middle with a basin of water on it. The priest was then sent for, who, upon entering the room, was received by the father of the infant and led to the baptismal water, which he consecrated by a short prayer and the sign of a cross; then the mother presented to him her babe, which he laid on his left arm, and in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost he thrice dipped his hand in the water and dropped some of it on the child's forehead, giving it a name. . . . Most generally the infants are baptized in the churches. Before the altar stands a tripod holding a basin of consecrated water for baptism." This was the baptism proper. The preparatory immersions which the Greeks—at least in some places—practise would be performed in another apartment and without the presence of the priest.

4. The immersions were not baptisms proper. In earlier days, persons when immersed were naked. Deaconesses were appointed to officiate at the immersion of women and of girls. These immersions were preparatory to the baptisms proper, which were performed by the minister. The minister was not required to be present while the parties, being naked, submitted to the trine immersions.

170. What word do the Greeks use for immersion?

Since immersion has become a practice among the Greeks they use the Greek word *kataduo* and its derivatives, which means "to dip under," "to cause the sinking of," "to immerse." The word *baptizo* would not answer their purpose, because, in common usage, it was employed to express any kind of religious washing, however partial.

171. Will you give some illustrations to show that the Greeks use the word *kataduo* to indicate the act of immersion?

1. Cyril, *of Jerusalem:* "Plunge them down (*kataduete*) thrice into the water, and raise them up again."

2. Basil: "By three immersions (*en trisi katadusesi*) and by the like number," etc.

3. John Damascenus: "Baptism is a type of the death of Christ; for by three immersions, (*kataduseon,*)" etc.

4. Photius: "To immerse (*katadusai*) a child three times in the bath," etc.

5. Dr. Cramp asks: "What can be fairer than to submit the question to the Greeks themselves? They must surely understand their own language." The question has been submitted to them, and it appears that when they wanted to express the *action of putting under water* they chose the word *kataduo.* If these Greek writers believed that *baptizo* expressed definitely the act of immersion, why did they select other words to express that action, and employ *baptizo* in cases where there was no immersion?

XXXVIII.—Christ's Ordination.

172. When did Christ's ordination take place?

Christ was ordained about the close of John's ministry, and when he was sprinkled with water by John and anointed with the Holy Ghost. (See page 24.)

173. Was it necessary that Christ should be ordained for the work of the ministry and priesthood?

Yes. Every high-priest had to be ordained in things pertaining to God. (Hebrews 5 : 1.) All generations are bound together in one moral system, having one God and one religion, whose principles do not change. In the old dispensation, as in the new, those who have been called to the sacred office of the ministry in the church were required to be set apart by consecration or ordination. In Christ we have the high-priest typified

in the old dispensation, and in him we have the first and greatest preacher of the new.

174. What does Dr. Cramp affirm respecting Christ's baptism for the work of the priesthood?

1. Dr. Cramp appears to teach that Christ was not a priest at all. He says: "These are novelties in theology. The baptism of the Saviour did not take place under the law. There was no command of the kind in the law." Matthew taught differently; for he says Christ came to John to be baptized, for thus it became him to fulfill the requirements of the law.

2. Dr. Cramp says: "I must confess my astonishment at the childish folly of those who assert that our Lord was baptized in order to be qualified for the priesthood. One person says that 'by it he was inducted into the priesthood at the age of thirty years.' . . . These objectors carry on the argument (if, indeed, it be worthy of the name) in this manner: The priests under the law were ceremonially purified before taking office by sprinkling; Jesus was inducted into the priesthood by baptism, therefore baptism is sprinkling! Ink and paper need not be wasted in exposing such absurdities." (*Cramp's Cor. and Catechism.*)

3. Dr. Cramp displays characteristic tact in passing over this point with a peculiar rhetorical flourish, that is meant to occupy a place that would have been better filled by substantial reasoning. It may be the easiest way by which he can dispose of the question, though it may not be the most satisfactory. The learned doctor fears that an expenditure of his "ink and paper" on this subject would be "wasted." His economical discretion is judicious, as any effort of his in that direction would doubtless be "wasted" effort. Some, however, may regret that he has not condescended to prove, if it were possible, that the baptism of Christ was not an ordaining or consecrating act, connected with the assumption of his official work.

175. What views are held by divines concerning our Lord's baptism?

Various and conflicting views are held. Some do not hold opinions coincident with those expressed in this work, while the views of others harmonize therewith.

176. Why do you reject those antagonistic opinions?

1. They are not sustained by the Scriptures.

2. They are contradictory, unreasonable, and improbable. Among those whose theory respecting this question seems unsatisfactory are some authors whose names are revered household words in the churches. An examination of their expressed hypotheses as to why Christ was baptized will show that a wide disagreement exists among them; and such a want of harmony indicates a misconception of the truth. We find the truth by studying, not those great critics, but the inspired word of God.

177. How do you prove the necessity and fact of Christ's ordination?

Hebrews 5 : 1, 4, 10: "For every high-priest taken from among men is ordained." . . . "No man taketh this honor unto himself but he that is called of God." . . . "Called of God an high-priest."

Hebrews 2 : 17: "In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest." His brethren were under the dominion of a law which required ordination; and this ordination involved the sprinkling of water upon them at thirty years of age. He could not have been a faithful high-priest if he had failed to keep the law in any one particular. It behoved him "in all things" to be made like unto his brethren.

178. Do any of the learned critics take this view of Christ's baptism?

1. Adam Clarke, LL.D.; "'It becometh us to fulfill all righteousness'—that is, every righteous ordinance.

The baptism of Christ was necessary; our Lord represented the high-priest, and was to be the high-priest over the house of God. Now, as the high-priest was initiated by washing—baptism—('thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: sprinkle water of purifying upon them,' Numbers 8 : 7,) and anointing, so must Christ; hence he was baptized and anointed with the Holy Ghost. Thus he fulfilled the righteous ordinance of his initiation into the office of high-priest."

2. William Nast, D.D.: "This baptism was also proper for Jesus. It was . . . the ordination for the Messianic office." . . . "Jesus fulfilled all righteousness by being introduced into his Messianic office by baptism." . . . "This solemn and sublime recognition of our Lord in his official character involves," etc.

3. D. D. Wheden, D.D.: "John's baptism of Jesus was an unction for his kingship or priesthood."

4. Neander: "His baptism by John was the symbol of the preparatory consecration." . . . "For his outward calling and solemn introduction into office he looked to him."

5. J. P. Lange, D.D.: "In contrast with the baptism of the Pharisees and Sadducees we have here the baptism of Jesus. . . . And this constituted, so to speak, the consecration for his work."

6. F. G. Hibbard, D.D.: "The next step in our inquiry will be to ascertain what law, then in vogue, required the Saviour to be baptized. There were various ordinances of ablution among the Jews; but these, in general, could not be supposed to apply to Christ. We can not suppose our Lord to have previously contracted any ceremonial defilement which was the reason of his baptism. But observe the particular juncture. Our Lord was about to enter upon his public ministry. He had attained his thirtieth year—the year at which, by the appointment of God, the priests under the law were to undertake the duties of their office—and he was a high-priest. . . . If we examine the whole code of Mo-

ses, we shall find no law that required Christ to be baptized, at this particular juncture, but the law enjoining and regulating priestly consecration."

7. W. Morley Punshon: "In silence corresponding to all the unostentatious adjuncts of the Saviour has the work of preparation begun. In retirement he has received his fitness for the public ministry; in retirement he has been baptized into consecration by his reluctant forerunner."

8. John Cumming, D.D.: "The law was then in force, and it became Jesus, as under the law, while the law of Levi lasted, to fulfill all righteousness, and to join all the outward administrations of Levi, just as any other Jew. It was not because Jesus needed regeneration; nor was baptism, in his case, meant to be the type, the symbol, or the seal of it. But he was baptized as introductory to his great office, which he began to fill at thirty years of age, when he began to preach the great truths that he sealed with his precious blood."

9. W. O'Neill: "There can be little doubt, I think, but that the baptism or purification of our Lord at the Jordan, in whatsoever way it was performed, was but his inaugural rite into the high-priesthood, 'over the house of God,' on which that day he was to enter. That office he came from heaven to earth to assume; and as the ancient priests of the law were all typical of him, he enters on his work at a similar time, and in a similar manner, to what they had done. They were to commence it at 'thirty years of age;' so did he. They were to be 'washed (sprinkled) with water,' as a ceremony of purification; so was he. They were to be anointed with 'precious ointment;' he was anointed with the Spirit without measure. They were to be clad in priestly garments of glory and beauty; he was already arrayed in the glorious beauty of his own perfect humanity, and the fullness of the Godhead resident in him. In these different points I perceive an exact agreement between the types and the antitype, and thus it

became him 'to fulfill all righteousness,' that no part of the law of the priesthood might be omitted, and that that correspondence might appear."

10. J. H. Godwin: "John was both prophet and priest; but the first was his chief character. As a prophet he preached to the people; as a priest, he used a rite of purification similar to those administered by the priests. All public purifications with water, and all in which one person acted on another, were by sprinkling or affusion. These, and only these, were appointed by the law; and they are called baptisms. The same name was given to the common purifications of the Jews. There is nothing in any of the narratives of the New Testament to lead to the supposition that, either by John or by the disciples of Jesus, any persons were ever baptized except in the way in which the priests were accustomed to baptize people in public, by the sprinkling of water. The same term which is used for the *rite* is also used for the *reality* of which it is an emblem. As there was a circumcision of the body and a circumcision of the mind, so there was a baptism of the body and a baptism of the mind."

11. Christ was prophet, priest, and king. He was more than any of his predecessors. He spake with an authority peculiar to himself. He was a priest after the order of Melchisedec; that is, he was a royal priest. He has a name, therefore, which is above every name. He was none the less a priest or king because he was a prophet; he was none the less a prophet or king because he was a priest; he was none the less a prophet or priest because he was a king. It is said, in Zechariah 6 : 13, "He shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne." Christ, as a priest, was made like unto his brethren in all things required by the law. John the Forerunner was properly qualified, because of his official position, to apply to Christ the sprinkling of water, without which he could not legally have performed the functions of his priesthood.

12. Dr. Cramp is amazed at the fact that such opinions are held and taught; and he has expressed his astonishment at what he considers this "childish folly." His astonishment is natural and suggestive. A clear and consistent exegesis of this subject exposes the absurdity involved in the dogma that Christ was baptized as an example for us; and that Christ was baptized by immersion.

XXXIX.—Dipping Difficulties.

179. Will you mention some of the difficulties involved in the immersionist theory?

1. On the day of Pentecost three thousand persons were converted and baptized. The gift of the Holy Spirit came upon the assembled brethren. "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak." This became "noised abroad." A multitude of devout men of different nations, then in the city, hearing of these things, went to the house where the brethren were assembled. These were all amazed, and had something to say "one to another." Peter standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice and preached. This speaking, and this gathering of the multitude, and this preaching, must have consumed a considerable portion of the day. The Baptist theory requires that in the remaining fragment of the day those three thousand persons must have each told his or her experience; and must have each been immersed, which would involve on the part of each a change of clothing. It seems difficult to comprehend how so much could have been accomplished in the swift-running moments of a fast-waning day. It is difficult to resist the suggestion that, if those three thousand persons must each be put under water, it would be needful, for various reasons, to defer a portion of the operation until the following day. To have baptized those three thousand persons by the mode predicted by the prophet, when speaking of these latter days, (Ezekiel 36 : 25 : "Then will I sprinkle clean water

upon you, and ye shall be clean,") would have been in accordance with existing usages, and could have been done in the house where the word was preached, and where the brethren received the baptism of the Spirit.

2. A difficulty also presents itself in reference to the place where such a ceremony could be performed. "No river passes the city; the nearest lake is many miles away; the brook Cedron is the dry bed of a little stream which only flows in the winter months." And neither wells, pools, nor cisterns could have been used for such a purpose.

3. The immersion of those three thousand persons would involve a public display in a city intensely hostile to the disciples, and their cause, and their Master. Dr. Cramp says, (*Catechism*, p. 38:) "There were public pools—the pool of Bethesda, the pool of Siloam, and others—at which the administration might have taken place without any difficulty." Dr. Cramp, obviously, does not comprehend the situation. There existed, among the authorities of the church and of the state in Jerusalem, as well as among the people, the bitterest hostility to Christ and to his gospel. It is impossible that Peter, with the other apostles and brethren, could have taken three thousand persons to any of the pools of the city, or any other public place, and immersed them, in the name of Jesus, "without any difficulty." An attempt to accomplish such a work in Jerusalem would have provoked a most furious opposition, and would have caused a wild and wide-spread uproar throughout the whole community. The prevailing popular sentiment of Jerusalem at that time would not have permitted their public pools to be used for a purpose so distasteful and abhorrent to the Jewish people.

4. The manifestation of the popular feeling, soon after the day of Pentecost, against Peter and John, for having professed to heal a lame man in Jerusalem "in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth," indicates what would have been the result if there had been an attempt to immerse

those three thousand persons in the public pools of that city. Peter and John were arrested and imprisoned and put upon their trial, because of the good deed done to the impotent man in the name of Jesus. The arrest of those brethren, and their imprisonment and their trial, show how malicious and how pervading was the hatred against Jesus and his disciples. If the knowledge of the performance of an isolated deed of mercy, like that of healing the lame man in a public place in the name of Jesus, had excited the populace, and had caused the assembling of the great council of the nation—"the rulers, and elders, and scribes, and high-priests"—how much more would the city have been moved with rage, and the authorities with indignation, if the brethren had attempted to immerse those three thousand persons in the pools, for which they cherished so much pride, and in the name of the Nazarene, whom they had hanged on a tree. The fact that there is no record of any opposition or any uproar, on the part of either the rulers or the people, on the day of Pentecost, suggests the inevitable inference that those three thousand persons baptized on that day could not have been immersed.

5. Immersionists affirm that baptizing is dipping, or plunging, or immersing, and that these terms are therefore synonymous. By subjecting their theory to a practical trial, and substituting one of these words for another, its absurdity will become apparent. Let us look at a few examples:

Matthew 3 : 11 : "I indeed plunge you with water unto repentance . . . he shall plunge you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire."

Matthew 20 : 22 : "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be plunged with the plunging that I am plunged with?"

Mark 1 : 4 : "John did plunge in the wilderness, and preach the plunging of repentance."

Mark 7 : 4 : "And when they come from the market, except they plunge, they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the

plunging of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables;" that is, beds and couches.

Acts 11 : 16 : "John indeed plunged with water; but ye shall be plunged with the Holy Ghost."

Acts 19 : 3 : "Unto what then were ye plunged? And they said, Unto John's plunging."

Romans 6 : 3, 4 : "Know ye not that so many of us as were plunged into Jesus Christ were plunged into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by plunging into death."

1 Cor. 12 : 13 : "For by one Spirit are we all plunged into one body."

If either the word "dip" or "immerse" were substituted for the word "plunge," in the quotations given above, the difficulty would be quite as manifest.

The same absurdity would appear in praying for the desirable baptism of the Holy Spirit in the dipping phraseology: O Lord, plunge my soul with the Holy Ghost; or, dip my soul with the Holy Ghost; or, plunge, or dip, this congregation with the Holy Ghost.

6. In 1 Cor. 10 : 1, 2, the Israelites are said to have been "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The Israelites were not plunged unto Moses, nor immersed unto Moses. Upon the Israelites the clouds dropped down rain. The Egyptians were immersed. But the Egyptians who were immersed were not baptized; and the Israelites who were baptized were not immersed. In 1 Peter 3 : 20, 21, there is a probable reference to the baptism of Noah and his family in the ark, by the rain which fell upon them. Peter shows that baptism is the antitype of the salvation of those eight souls. Yet the very gist of their salvation consisted in their not having been immersed at all. The unbelieving contemporaries of Noah who were immersed, and perished in the deluge, were not baptized; but the eight souls who were saved in the ark, and were baptized by the falling rain, were not immersed.

XL.—Immersionists and Infant Baptism.

180. What opinions are held by immersionists respecting the antiquity of infant baptism?

Immersionists are not able to point to the date at which the practice of infant baptism, which they consider an innovation, was first adopted. Nor are they able to state the circumstances under which, nor the persons by whom, the supposed innovation was introduced. It is not probable that a change in the theology and the practice of the church so radical as is involved in the introduction of the practice of infant baptism, could have been introduced without criticism and censure sufficiently sharp and emphatic to attract the notice of the historian. Immersionists, recognizing this fact, have professed to be able to fix the time when this supposed novelty first appeared.

181. At what period is it supposed by immersionists that infant baptism was introduced?

Immersionists disagree among themselves respecting the time. And they not only contradict each other, but they sometimes contradict themselves.

182. What do you infer from such contradictions?

Where there is want of accord among the wisest and ablest advocates and defenders of a creed, the inference is inevitable that the creed is seriously defective.

183. Will you mention an instance of contradiction?

1. Dr. Cramp says, (*Christian Messenger*, January 11th, 1865:) "Infant baptism . . . first appeared in *the middle of the third century*."

2. Dr. Cramp, again, in his *Catechism*, refers to Tertullian, and quotes from him. He says that Tertullian "protested against the innovation" involved in the baptism of little children. Dr. Cramp says this baptism of infants is "the first mention of such baptism, and it is mentioned in order to be opposed." Dr. Cramp, again, says that "Tertullian lived in the latter end of the sec-

ond century, and the beginning of the third. He died about the year 220."

3. Dr. Cramp might also have said that Tertullian was born about the middle of the second century. He embraced the heresy of Montanus about the year 200. His orthodox works were written before he ceased to be a Presbyter. Dr. Joseph Angus, an immersionist, gives the year 198 as the date of his orthodox works.

4. Dr. Cramp again says: "What do you suppose, then, was the state of opinion and practice in the Christian church, in reference to baptism, at the beginning of the third century? The design and efficacy of the ordinance were to a great extent misunderstood, and superstition (infant baptism) was advancing with rapid strides. Still, it was generally held that baptism was an act of dedication to God. It was believers' baptism, and the churches were what are now called Baptist churches. The only exceptions were in Africa, where the baptism of children had been partially introduced." That is, about the year 200 infant baptism had been, at some former period, introduced.

184. How does it appear that Dr. Cramp is contradictory?

1. Dr. Cramp says, in the *Christian Messenger*, in 1865, that infant baptism first appeared about the middle of the third century.

2. A year later he admits, in his *Catechism*, that Tertullian opposed the practice of infant baptism, which had already made its appearance. And Tertullian was born about the middle of the second century, and published his works, from which Dr. Cramp quotes, about the year 198; and died in 220.

3. Tertullian wrote about infant baptism as an established practice, which had been the custom of the church before his time. Dr. Cramp's admission that Tertullian, born about the middle of the second century, "mentioned" infant baptism as a practice already existing, con-

trasts impressively with his statement a year previously, in the *Christian Messenger*, that "infant baptism first appeared in the middle of the third century."

185. What does Dr. Cramp say about Origen?

1. Dr. Cramp says, Origen "was ordained to the Christian ministry in Palestine; was a laborious student, a very learned man, but a fanciful theologian." Origen was born in the year 185, and died in the year 254.

2. Dr. Cramp, again, says, (*Catechism*, p. 22:) "In the passages which refer to baptism, admitting them to be Origen's, he says that 'infants are baptized for the remission of sins.' In one place he observes that baptism is administered 'even to little children according to the usage of the church;' and in another, that 'the church has received from the Apostles a tradition to give baptism even to little children.'"

186. How does Dr. Cramp dispose of the teachings of Origen?

He assumes that Origen was not sound in his theology—that he could not adduce a "Thus saith the Lord" in confirmation of the right to baptize infants—that he was "a fanciful theologian"—and that what Origen taught was only "the usage of the church" and "tradition." Dr. Cramp says: "Origen knew that it was only a tradition, and that neither precept nor precedent had been discovered in the New Testament."

187. What do you learn from these admissions?

1. Dr. Cramp's admissions show that the defense of his creed involves him in contradictions. He admits that Origen, born in the second century, taught that infant baptism was "the usage of the church," and that the church in the time of Origen held the "tradition" that infant baptism had existed in the Apostles' day. The disagreement apparent between these admissions and Dr. Cramp's previous teaching, that "infant baptism first appeared in the middle of the third century," is

suggestive. Dr. Cramp has blundered somewhere. If the church received from the Apostles a tradition to give baptism to infants—and if Origen, as he affirms, was himself baptized in infancy, then Dr. Cramp's assertions are unworthy of acceptance, and his creed needs revision and amendment.

Dr. Cramp appears to think that he has disposed of the difficulty, which Origen gives his creed, by affirming that Origen had no better ground for teaching that infants should be baptized than "tradition" and the prevailing "custom of the church;" and by affirming that the New Testament does not teach the doctrines that Origen believed and taught. The point, however, which we are now considering is, not what is taught in the Scriptures on this subject—that point is elsewhere investigated—but *what was the practice in Origen's time*, from the year 185 to the year 254; and *what did Origen say* was the practice of the church *from the Apostles' day?* On these points Origen's testimony is clear, and shows that infant baptism was practised in his day and had been handed down from the Apostles themselves.

XLI.—The Covenant of Grace.

188. Were infants included in the Covenant of Grace?

Infants were included with their parents in the covenant of grace. They always received the seal of that covenant; and they can not therefore be excluded without an express command from God. The practice of infant baptism may be justified by the continuity and identity of the covenant of grace to Jew and Christian, the sign only of admission being altered.

189. Does the covenant of grace still exist?

The covenant which God made with Abraham is the gospel covenant, and under it we now live.

190. Are all the provisions of the covenant still binding?

The covenant embraced several incidental matters which were peculiar to Abraham's natural seed, the Jews. But all these have either expired by limitation, or been revoked, or changed, by God's command. That covenant at the same time included the promise of the Messiah and all the blessings of the Gospel. It clearly included the Gospel itself and the gospel church and all its blessings.

Gen. 17 : 7 : "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee."

Gen. 22 : 16–18 : "By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son :

"That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies ;

"And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice."

These passages show that God's covenant with Abraham was "an everlasting covenant," and included a blessing for "all the nations of the earth." That must have been the gospel covenant.

191. Does the New Testament teach that the covenant with Abraham included the gospel dispensation?

1. Yes. It teaches that the covenant with Abraham comprehended a spiritual family, including all the faithful, so that those who obey the gospel are included in the promise as Abraham's promised children. It is believed that the declaration, "In thee shall all nations be blessed," was the Gospel preached before unto Abraham.

Gal. 3 : 6–9 : "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.

"Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.

"And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.

"So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham."

2. In Gal. 3 : 12–14, Paul shows that the blessing of the Gospel enjoyed by the Gentiles is declared to be the blessing of Abraham or the blessing promised to Abraham : "And the law is not of faith : but, The man that doeth them shall live in them.

"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us : for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree :

"That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."

192. Was there danger lest the covenant made with Abraham should in any way become confounded with the Mosaic system?

1. Yes; and Paul indicates the distinction between the two, in Gal. 3 : 15–19 : "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.

"And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, can not disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.

"For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise : but God gave it to Abraham by promise.

"Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator."

2. From this passage, "it is certain, that the Gospel is but a continuation of the covenant made with Abraham, that the gospel church with its blessings is a fulfillment of that covenant, and that it is not a new thing, but a continuation of the Abrahamic family, with such alterations as were required to adapt it to a wider circle by the incorporation of the Gentiles."

193. Does Paul elsewhere teach the same doctrine?

Paul, under the figure of an olive-tree, shows that the gospel church is the old Abrahamic tree, with the Gentiles graffed on.

Romans 11 : 17–21 : "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree;

"Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

"Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in.

"Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear:

"For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee."

194. Did infants receive the seal of the covenant of grace?

Yes. Circumcision was the seal of the covenant in the Judaic dispensation, and that seal was placed upon infants.

Gen. 17 : 10 : "This is my covenant which he shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised."

Romans 4 : 11 : "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised."

195. What change was made respecting the seal of the covenant under the new dispensation?

This subject has been very briefly considered at page 38. Baptism takes the place of circumcision and is now the seal of the covenant. "Circumcision was a mark of difference between the people of God and the uncovenanted world, and baptism is now that same mark of distinction." It follows, therefore, of necessity that infants are to have the seal of the covenant placed upon them—that is, they are to be baptized.

196. What inference appears inevitable from these teachings?

The gospel church is no more and no other than the perfecting of the Abrahamic covenant. The truth, as involved in the covenant made with Abraham and sealed by circumcision, is confirmed in Christ, and we are enjoying the perfected state of that covenant in the privileges and blessings of the gospel church.

Romans 15 : 8, 9 : "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers :

"And that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy; as it is written, For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name."

197. Does a change of the seal involve a change of the subjects of the seal?

As infants are included in the covenant of grace, and made partakers of its benefits, and as they received the former seal, they must receive the present seal, which is baptism. Nothing but an express command can preclude infants from the rite of baptism. No such command has been given. No such preclusion has been intimated. There is no record in the Scriptures that favors it. A special enactment to baptize infants was not needed. The existing covenant covered the whole ground; and infant baptism was required under the

circumstances, as no command had been issued forbidding it.

XLII.—The Great Commission.

198. When was the great commission given?

After the resurrection of our Lord and just previous to his ascension.

Matthew 28 : 18–20: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:

"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

199. What does this commission teach respecting infant baptism?

1. The commission teaches that we are to make disciples of all persons—all nations. A nation includes the children of the nation. They were therefore to make disciples of the children. This is to be done by, first, baptizing them, and then teaching them. After they have been baptized, let them be taught so that they shall grow in grace, in wisdom, in knowledge, and in usefulness. The immersionist exegesis, which requires that we shall first complete religious instruction and then baptize, is manifestly wrong.

2. According to two of the most important uncial MSS., the Vatican, (B,) and the Cambridge Codex, (Codex Bezæ or D,) the Greek reading is: "Make disciples of all, and having baptized (*baptisantes*) them, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teach them to observe," etc. Lange says, this is the more correct reading, and that the text implies "two acts, a missionary and an ecclesiastical—the antecedent baptism, the subsequent instruction." Meyer

says, the text according to the reading of the majority of the MSS. with the present participle (*baptizontes*) even, requires first baptism and then teaching. ALFORD says, this passage implies: "the initiatory, admissory rite, and the subsequent teaching. It is much to be regretted that the rendering in our Bible has clouded the meaning of these important words. It will be observed that in our Lord's words, as in the church, the process of ordinary discipleship is from baptism to instruction, that is, is admission in infancy to the covenant, and growing up into the observance of all things."

XLIII.—THE SCHOOL OF CHRIST.

200. What provision has Christ made for us as the great Teacher?

He has provided for teaching all nations.

201. What are the conditions for scholarship?

1. All adult persons who will come, may come, into Christ's school, by accepting him as their authority and guide, and by having faith in him.

2. All infant children may be brought into this school.

3. Baptism is the entrance to this school. Peter received the Gentiles to the church by baptism. The Epistles, which were designed to teach those who were in Christ's school, assume that all the disciples have been baptized.

202. Is it right to baptize the children of unconverted parents?

Yes; if the parents bring them. The fact that parents bring their children to be baptized implies, on the part of the parents, an outward profession of Christ, and beyond this we have no authority to claim.

203. What example has Christ set respecting the admission of infants into his church?

1. Christ received infants when brought to him. He

did not stop to inquire about the character or motives of the parents who brought their children to him. He declared that they were subjects of his kingdom—hence they were entitled to admission therein. He did not baptize them: Christian baptism had not been then instituted. No adult person had then received Christian baptism. From what Christ said and did, the inference follows that, if Christian baptism had been at that time an institution of the church, the infants whom Christ had declared to be members of his kingdom would have received baptism.

2. Christ does not limit the ways in which little children are to come to him. He leaves every practicable and conceivable way wide open. Entrance into covenant with Christ is one of the ways by which little children can come to him. From Christ's command to "suffer little children" to come unto him, we infer that he does not stop up a single one of those open and traveled roads, whereby at any time children can come to him. Since he does not, we should not. "He openeth, and no man shutteth."

204. What do the Scriptures teach respecting childhood scholarship?

1. The Scriptures teach that children should be brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. 6 : 4.) The interests of Christ's kingdom are all-important; and the souls of men are precious beyond all price; it is therefore of the greatest moment that the earliest as well as the most careful efforts be made to train up children aright.

2. The church of Christ is a school. The course of education is summed up in the order and the studies which the Master prescribes. In this school are those who have placed themselves under the instruction and directions of the Master; and those also whose parents have placed them there to grow up under the Master's authority, and discipline, and counsels. Persons are not admitted to this school because they have been taught,

but because they need to be taught. Some are considerably advanced in instruction. Some do not know the alphabet. Some only have their names enrolled. There is no law in the case which "forbids" children to be brought into this school, except immersionist law. They are not required to wander as idlers and truants until they can appreciate the importance of scholarship. The consent of the children is not required. Upon the parent devolves the right and duty of putting his own children to school without their consent. Their names may be enrolled before they have begun to learn. The act of admission and enrollment is baptism.

3. The Scriptures assure us that, if children are brought up in the way they should go, they will not depart from it. Experience sometimes appears to contradict the statements of the inspired word. Many Christian parents train their children unwisely or unfaithfully. When the children of such parents depart from the truth, their education must have been defective. Discipline may have been administered from the stand-point of anger; whereas it should always have been administered from the stand-point of love; or in some other way, probably, the education has been not sufficiently comprehensive, and discriminating, and persevering.

4. By the covenant relations into which God has condescended to enter with man, it is predetermined that infants should have the privilege of scholarship in the church. Admission to such scholarship implies the reception previously of the admissory rite of baptism.

XLIV.—The Day of Pentecost.

205. Did Peter allude to the baptism of infants in his sermon on the day of Pentecost?

1. Peter urged the importance of repentance and baptism.

Acts 2 : 38, 39 : "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus

Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

"For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off."

2. Peter evidently referred to the promise made to Abraham, which included infants. He was a Jew, and was preaching to Jews; and these must have understood him as including infants in this promise. LANGE says, in a note on this passage: "The church and the people of God had hitherto been so constituted that not only adults but also little children belonged to the people of God, and with all these he made a covenant that he would be their God. Let us now suppose that, on the day of Pentecost, Peter had thus addressed the Jews: 'Brethren, repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; but your little children shall not be baptized; they shall remain in their sins, continue in their state of condemnation, and be counted among the people of Satan, until they grow up and reach the years of understanding;' what answer would the devout Jews have made? . . . . . If the Apostles had made holy baptism, which is the true door of the kingdom of heaven, narrower, by instituting a baptismal examination, as those deluded spirits do who degrade the sacrament of baptism to the rank of an exhibition of certificates of their full-grown 'believers,' then these three thousand could never have been added on the same day."

XLV.—APOSTOLIC EXAMPLES.

206. Did the Apostles baptize infants?

It is evident from the Scriptures that the Apostles baptized infants. Various passages indicate that fact.

Acts 16 : 31–33: "And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.

"And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house.

"And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway."

207. How does it appear from this passage that infants are entitled to baptism?

By the phraseology employed by Paul. He used two different Greek words on this occasion, which, in our version, are rendered "house"—*oikos* and *oikia*. The word *oikos* is used by both Old and New Testament writers in the sense of *family*, with special reference to *infants*, and the same word *oikos* is frequently used in the classic Greek to express the same meaning. The word *oikia* is used by the same writers in the sense of *household*, including servants. The passage just quoted should read: "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy family, (*oikos*,) (including all thy children.) And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his household, (*oikia*,) (including servants, if any.) And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his (*oikos*) straightway." He preached to all that were in the house, (*oikia*,) servants and all others; but he only baptized the jailer and his (*oikos*) family. The promise was to him and his *oikos*—his family, including his children of whatever age. The *oikia*—servants of the jailer—heard the word; but we do not read that one of the *oikia* was baptized, whereas this we do read of the jailer, and *all his house;* which is precisely what the Apostle foretold.

208. Do other passages of Scripture indicate the same teachings?

1. Yes. Lydia and her *oikos*, and Stephanus and his *oikos*, were baptized.

2. It is difficult to imagine any phraseology that could have been employed, which would more clearly express the fact that the Apostles baptized infants. If the narrative stated in any direct terms, "The Apostles bap-

tized infants," still objections might have been urged. Origen, who was born in the second century, and who was in a position to be acquainted with the facts, says that the Apostles baptized infants; and immersionists exclaim: "Fanciful theologian"—"Metaphorical infants." No words can so teach any doctrine but unscrupulous controversialists may object.

3. LANGE says, (in note on Acts 16 : 15 :) "The real strength of the argument (namely, that as households include children, we have no right to except them from the general statement) lies not in any one case, but in the repeated mention of whole houses as baptized."

BENGEL says: "Who can believe that not one infant was found in all these families, and that Jews, accustomed to the circumcision, and Gentiles, accustomed to the lustration of infants, should not have also brought them to baptism?"

209. Is the testimony of the early fathers, and historians of the church, in harmony with these views?

1. Their testimony is in exact coincidence therewith. Tertullian was the first person who wrote against infant baptism. He published his works about the year 198. From these we learn that infant baptism was practised then, or he would not have written against it. This was more than a century before Constantine was converted, and hence it was before the introduction of corruption into the church, through its connection with the state. If infant baptism had been introduced after Tertullian's birth, which was about the middle of the second century, his strongest argument would have been, This is a new thing—the Apostles never baptized infants. But he never intimated that it was an innovation.

2. The fragments of history that have come down to us from the earliest times of the Christian church are all in favor of infant baptism. The fact that there is no record of the introduction of this practice, is strong evidence that it was the custom of the church from the beginning.

3. Dr. Wall says: "For the first four hundred years after Christ, there appears only one man, Tertullian, who advises the delay of infant baptism in some cases, and one Gregory, who did, perhaps, practise such delay in the case of his own children; but no society of men so thinking or so practising; or any one man saying it was unlawful to baptize infants. So, in the next seven hundred years, there is not so much as one man to be found, who either spoke for or practised such delay, but all the contrary."

XLVI.—Believers' Baptism.

210. Do the Scriptures teach that, under certain circumstances, faith is required before baptism?

Yes. All persons, morally responsible, who have not received baptism, and who seek admission to the Christian church, are required to believe before being baptized.

211. Do immersionists differ from others on this point?

1. Immersionists do not differ on this point from others. They sometimes mislead, by presenting passages to prove that believers were baptized in apostolic times, which is a fact admitted by all. Moreover, it is sometimes urged that they hold the baptism of believers, and their antagonists the baptism of infants. Such a representation is a misstatement of the case.

2. The baptism of believers is common ground to the Protestant Church. Every instance recorded in the Bible of faith being required in order to baptism, is a case where affusionists would require faith in order to baptism. From the multitude who were converted on the day of Pentecost, from Saul of Tarsus, from the eunuch, from Lydia, from the jailer of Philippi, and from all other Jewish proselytes and Gentiles, a profession of faith would of course be required.

3. There are nine cases mentioned in the Scriptures where faith preceded baptism; and any one of these is

enough to prove that any person, in the same circumstances as they were, must believe in order to be baptized. But mark what these circumstances were: Every one of them, up to the period of his baptism, was either a Jew or a Jewish proselyte, a Samaritan or a heathen; each one of them was an adult coming into the Christian church from the world beyond it; each one of them was the case of a person whose parents had not been Christians; and none of them had ever received Christian baptism before.

4. Immersionists differ from others in affirming that because an adult needs faith before baptism, therefore an infant needs faith before baptism. His logic does not carry conviction with it when he affirms, because a profession of faith was needed from Jews, Samaritans, and pagans, on their entrance into the church, therefore the infants of those in church membership already need to make a profession of faith, or be excluded from baptism for want of it. If faith before baptism is required from adults, in certain circumstances, it does not follow from that fact, that faith before baptism is required from infants in *totally different circumstances.* A person who would settle in another country and under another flag than those of his birth, is required to secure articles of naturalization before he can claim the rights of a citizen or a subject in the country and under the flag of his adoption; but he who is born within the realm may claim the rights of a citizen or of a subject, as his by birth. The circumstances peculiar to the alien and to the home-born are materially different, and have an important bearing on the question of citizenship. For the alien there must have been an initiatory rite—the profession of faith or fidelity (sometimes called an "oath of allegiance") to the nationality into which he would enter. From those born in the realm no such pledge is required; the rights of citizenship are theirs by birth; they are free-born. Infants belong to the kingdom. No such profession is required of them as of the alien, to en-

title them to membership in the Christian nationality. Let their membership, then, be recognized by baptism.

XLVII.—Objections considered.

212. Will you state some of the objections to infant baptism, and how those objections may be answered?

The principal objections urged against infant baptism have been examined by Dr. Luther Lee, in his *Elements of Theology*, and may be here reproduced.

1. "It is objected that there is no scriptural warrant for infant baptism.

"To this it is replied, the objection is not admitted. It is insisted that a scriptural warrant has been made out in the preceding arguments. Whether or not there is a scriptural warrant for infant baptism, is the main question at issue, and to object that there is no such warrant, is to beg the whole question. It is thus seen that the objection can not be admitted in this form.

2. "It is objected that there is no express command in the Scriptures to baptize infants. In this form the objection is admitted, as a fact, but the conclusion is denied on the following grounds:

"(1.) No express command was necessary, as infants had always been admitted, Jewish children by circumcision, and Gentile children with their parents, by circumcision and baptism. It required a command to exclude them, rather than one to admit them. This has been proved in the direct argument, and the argument need not be repeated.

"(2.) The absence of an express command is not sufficient to exclude infants from baptism only upon the assumption that nothing of like kind is to be done without an express command. This can not be maintained. There is no express command for admitting females to the Lord's Supper. It is clear that no females were present at its institution, and there is no command to admit them. So far then as the simple want of an

express command is concerned, female communion must be abandoned or the objection to infant baptism must be abandoned. There is no express command for observing the first day of the week as a Sabbath, and yet it is almost a universal custom. There are a very few Baptists, known as 'Seventh-Day Baptists,' who are consistent enough with the ground they are compelled to take to oppose infant baptism, to repudiate the Christian Sabbath and keep the Jewish Sabbath. The nature of the evidence in both cases is the same.

3. "It has been objected that infants can not believe. It is not insisted that they can believe. The reply rests upon other grounds.

"(1.) Infants could not believe when they received circumcision, and yet that very circumcision was a seal of the righteousness which was by faith. And faith was required of all who were old enough to believe, in order to receive circumcision; yet children who could not believe were included with their believing parents, and circumcised without being able to believe.

"(2.) Faith is more clearly in order to salvation than it is to baptism. 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' This, some contend, excludes all but believers. In a limited sense it does, but only so far as to exclude all unbelieving parents with their children; but it includes all believing parents, and the children of believing parents are included with them by the very terms of the covenant. This has been proved. If it were not so, it would exclude infants from salvation; for it is added, 'he that believeth not shall be damned.' This shows that these words of the commission do not take cognizance of the case of infants, or it would exclude them from salvation, and of course we are left to fall back upon the terms of the covenant to learn what relation they sustain to the ordinance of baptism, which has been proved to be the initiatory rite of the covenant of grace. It does not say he that is not baptized shall be damned, but only 'he that believeth not;' so that while infants are included with their believing

parents to receive the seal of the covenant by baptism, the children of unbelieving parents are not excluded from salvation by being excluded from baptism, as it is not the unbaptized, but he that believeth not that is damned, which is not true of infants. It can not be said that infants believe not, any more than it can be said that they believe.

4. "It has been objected that baptizing infants, by which they are committed to the obligations of the covenant, is doing them a wrong, by taking away their privilege of choosing their own religion. To this objection it is replied,

"(1.) The same objection could have been used with equal force against circumcision. The Jew not only committed his children to the covenant, but the Gentile, when he embraced the Abrahamic faith, also committed his infant offspring to the same religion. Was that wrong? If not, it can be no more wrong now to commit them by baptism, whereby the parent pledges to bring them up in the faith of the Gospel.

"(2.) Children never had the right of choosing any but the true religion. What that true religion is, the parent, under God, is the judge, and is bound to commit his children to, and bring them up to believe what he believes to be the true religion, to the extent of his ability so to do. In so doing, he takes away no right from the child. When the child becomes old enough, it in turn becomes its right to judge what is the true religion, and it must assume the responsibilities of the religion to which the parent committed it, or repudiate them, and this is the right of every human being, being held accountable to God. So the duty of the parent is performed, and no right is taken from the child.

"(3.) Parents not only have the right of choosing the religion for their children, but it is their most solemn duty so to do, and God always has and does now hold parents responsible for the religion of their children while they are under their control, so far as belief and external conformity are concerned.

5. "It has been objected that it can do infants no good to baptize them. In reply to this it may be remarked,

"(1.) The same objection might have been urged against circumcision. Indeed, it may be urged against what is called believers' baptism. The thing in itself can do no good, to sprinkle a little water upon a man, or to put him under the water. If a man should fall into the water and be immersed by accident, he would not feel himself particularly benefited; but when he is baptized, he is or may be benefited. Wherein then is the difference? It arises out of the fact that God has commanded us to be baptized, and out of our conceptions of the relation which baptism sustains to the Christian system. All the good, after all, arises from the fact that God has appointed it. If then God has appointed it for infants, it is not for men to say it can do no good.

"(2.) If it be the seal of the covenant, as has been proved, it is presumption to say that when it is placed upon children, by their parents, in faith, such children are not brought into a more hopeful relation to the Christian system and the influences under it, by which they must be saved. Do parents pray for their infant children, before they are capable of moral action? It is presumed that pious parents do. But what good does it do? They are not capable of any conditional salvation, by faith, or any other condition on their part. But God can hear the parents' prayer of faith without the faith of the child. This is the only reply that can be made; and if this be a reason for praying for our infant children, placing the seal of the covenant upon them, may be, in the mind of God, as good a reason for doing on their behalf as our prayers, and no man can say that baptizing them does not do as much good as praying for them."

XLVIII.—The Immersionist Bible.

213. Do immersionists accept the English Bible as the word of God?

Many immersionists are dissatisfied with the old English Bible, and especially with its teachings on the subject of baptism. The authorized version of the Scriptures does not teach the doctrine of immersion. Leading immersionists have organized a society which bears the name of the "American Bible Union," whose chief object appears to be to secure the issue of a new version of the Scriptures that will teach the dogma of immersion.

214. Does the new version teach immersionist theology?

The new version teaches the immersionist theology with great directness and clearness. The suggestive and richly-freighted words "baptize" and "baptism" are expunged, and in their stead the Roman words "immerse" and "immersion" are substituted. The new Bible makes short work of the immersionist controversy, and at a single stroke attempts to unchurch all the followers of Christ who have not been immersed, and all Christian churches that do not stand on the immersionist platform.

215. Is this new version indorsed by any who are not immersionists?

1. It is sometimes disingenuously affirmed that different denominations coöperate in the publication of the new Bible. It is even sometimes asserted that ministers of the several Protestant churches are identified with immersionists in this enterprise. Those statements are manifestly absurd. It is impossible that a Christian minister, whose mode of baptism is sprinkling, could be a party to the publication of a book which condemns his own personal practice, his own creed, and the discipline of his own church. The testimony of any man would

be utterly worthless, in any court of justice, who would indorse the new immersionist Bible, and at the same time hold the ministerial office in a church which teaches that the "sprinkling of clean water" is the scriptural mode of baptism.

2. There are probably many good and wise men of the Baptist denomination, "too loyal to their own antecedents, too much alive to the permanent interests of that portion of Christ's church, too well versed in the languages of the Bible, too courteous to the Christian scholarship of the age, to accept the change thus forced upon them, and allow themselves to be unceremoniously thrust out of the Baptist Church and swept into the church of the immersionists."

216. Does the publication of the immersionist Bible tend to the promotion of the interests of truth?

As the immersionist Bible is obviously published in the interests of a denomination, its example is clearly pernicious. If immersionists may publish a Bible which shall teach the prominent, distinctive, and peculiar tenets of their creed, other denominations may follow their example. The different sects, professing to hold the truth revealed in the Scriptures, may each have their Bible which, with their peculiar interpretations of the original, shall settle in their own way all controverted points in theology. The "American Bible Union" has no more right to pervert the Scriptures in the interests of immersion, than any other sect has to pervert the Scriptures in its interests. The tendency of such a course must be deplorably adverse to the interests of truth.

217. What serious defects are apparent in the new version?

1. Some of the prominent defects of the new version have been noticed by Professor Jewett, substantially as follows:

"First, as an English work. While modernizing the

language of the common English version in many cases, it still retains many of its obsolescent forms, and is thus inconsistent with itself. Many of its renderings are unintelligible to the common reader. It frequently employs tautological expressions—as, 'from hence,' 'from thence,' 'from whence,' etc. It recognizes no law for the use of English relatives, using who and that indiscriminately, even in the same verse. It is equally indiscriminate and lawless as regards English auxiliaries, saying, 'are come,' 'has come,' 'was come,' etc., with no apparent law of selection. It recognizes no rule for the sequence of English tenses, changing back and forth, from past to present, and present to past, in the same sentence without rule or reason—as, 'I perceived that power has gone out of me'—'Jesus said to those who have believed on him,' etc. It is equally regardless of the proper use of the subjunctive and potential moods; employing the indicative as often as otherwise where doubt and futurity are both implied, and oscillating from future indicative to present subjunctive in the same passage and to express the same idea. Finally, it couples words indicating past time with the present tenses, and the reverse—as, 'In those days comes,' etc.

2. "The new version is also sadly defective as a translation from the Greek. Its renderings are often ambiguous, often servile, many times weak, or for other reasons so infelicitous that it is characterized by the utmost latitude of rendering, and is in not a few instances obviously incorrect in its translations. Numerous pages of evidence have been adduced to show beyond all peradventure that it is a disgrace to the scholarship of the day, and an affront to the intelligence, liberality, and Christian learning of the church.

3. "It is further objected to this version that it is evidently intended to be an instrument of denominational propagandism. This is apparent from the fact that 'baptism' is supplanted by 'immersion,' and 'baptize' by 'immerse,' etc., and that this change is univer-

sal. In fact, this is the only characteristic of the version, the only change from the common version which is carried persistently through. The aim seems to be to expunge from the New Testament the very idea of baptism, and substitute immersion—foreclosing all discussion.

4. "According to the declarations of immersionists, ten thousand times repeated, has not this word (baptize) always had a definite meaning, which they have expressed by 'baptize,' and of which they have claimed a sort of denominational ownership, boasting of their title of 'Baptists,' and excluding all other branches of the Christian church from the Lord's table, on the ground that they were unbaptized? If 'baptize' has always been the exact equivalent of 'baptize,' when did it lose its signification? When, how, by what process of defection, did it forfeit its ancient and honorable distinction, and come to mean something so different, so unlike its former signification, as to need to be impeached and removed from office, and forever disqualified from presiding over the interests of a large and growing portion of the church of Christ? 'Baptism' is Greek anglicized. 'Immersion' is Latin anglicized. The former is the language of the New Testament; the latter is the Roman form. The former is the language of inspiration; the latter is man's device. The former is the thing itself; the latter is what is affirmed to be its exact equivalent; then why exchange the one for the other? And if it is not an exact equivalent, then who are they who thus dare to pervert the word of God by foisting into it the carnal teachings of man?"

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Sept. 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

BV
811

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 665 037 5